Environment Canada Parks Service
Environnement Canada Service des parcs

WATERTON LAKES National Park

Management Plan Review

PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY

Background Information & Issues Identification

Canada

August, 1990

91-02060/

Waterton Lakes National Park - Management Plan Review

Public Input Summary - Background Information and Issues Identification

prepared for: Canadian Parks Service,Western Region

prepared by: Praxis

August 29, 1990

Table of Contents

Section One - Introduction 1
- 1.1 Background 1
- 1.2 The Public Consultation Process 1
- 1.3 Canadian Parks Service Response to Public Comments 2

Section Two - Public Comments - Written Input 5
- 2.1 Resource Protection and Management 5
  - 2.1.1 Physical Features and Biological Features 5
  - 2.1.2 Cultural Resources 8
  - 2.1.3 Resource Management Issues 10
- 2.2 Visitor Activities and Facilities 15
  - 2.2.1 Water-based Activities 15
  - 2.2.2 Backcountry Hiking and Camping 20
  - 2.2.3 Frontcountry Camping 26
  - 2.2.4 Sightseeing, Picnicking and Strolling (Leisure Activities) 29
  - 2.2.5 Horse Use 33
  - 2.2.6 Winter Activities 36
  - 2.2.7 Bicycling 37
  - 2.2.8 Golfing 39
  - 2.2.9 Heritage Appreciation and Interpretation 42
  - 2.2.10 Trip Planning and Park Information 44
  - 2.2.11 Opportunities for the Disabled 46
- 2.3 Waterton Townsite 48
- 2.4 Support Facilities 51
- 2.5 Regional Integration 54
- 2.6 Limits to Development 57
- 2.7 Other Comments 59

Section Three - Public Comments - Workshop Sessions 65
- 3.1 Resource Protection and Management 65
- 3.2 Backcountry Opportunities 66
- 3.3 Front Country Recreation 67
- 3.4 Townsite 68

Section One - Introduction

1.1 Background

In 1989, the Canadian Parks Service began a program to review the management plan for Waterton Lakes National Park. The review of the management plan includes opportunities for public comment at the following plan stages:

Park Purpose and Objectives Statement - In June 1989, a newsletter and response form were distributed. Public consultation was completed in July 1989 and a summary of this public input was prepared and distributed in November 1990.

Background Information and Issues Identification - Public consultation commenced in November 1989 with the distribution of a background information document and response form. In addition, a workshop was held in Lethbridge, Alberta on November 30. Public consultation was completed in January 1990 and the summary of public comments is included in this document.

Plan Concept - Public consultation will commence in the fall of 1990.

1.2 The Public Consultation Process - Background Information and Issues Identification Stage

Public input was sought through a mail-out program and through public workshops.

Mail-out Program

In November 1989, a background information document and response form were mailed to approximately 950 individuals and groups who had previously indicated an interest in the program. The background information document identified questions for the reader to consider in preparing written comments. The deadline for submission of written comments was January 10, 1990, although comments received after that date were also analyzed. In total there were 89 responses, including response forms, letters and briefs. Section Two of this document provides a summary of the written public comments.

Workshop Sessions

Public workshops were held in Lethbridge, Alberta on November 30. The workshops were advertised in the following media:

Radio	CJOC - Lethbridge, November 28 and 29
	CHEC - Lethbridge, November 27 and 28

Newspaper Lethbridge Herald, November 24 and 28
Cardston Chronicle/Raymond Review, November 14 and 28
Pincher Creek Echo, November 14 and 28

The workshop sessions included discussion groups on four topic areas:

Resource Protection and Management
Backcountry Opportunities
Frontcountry Recreation
Townsite

A total of approximately 75 people participated in the discussion groups. Section 3.0 of this document provides a summary of the comments received during the workshops.

1.3 Canadian Parks Service Response to Public Comments

From the public comments, a number of areas of concern have been identified. Particular attention will be paid to the following areas of concern during the development of the Plan Concept:

Resource Protection and Management

- placing a strong emphasis on protecting the park's natural, cultural and heritage resources, as a first priority
- educating visitors about their potential impact on park resources
- working more closely with regional land managers and playing a stronger role in regional issues which affect the park
- addressing wildlife habituation concerns
- examining the potential for catch/release programs for fisheries management

Visitor Activities and Facilities

- strictly limiting new facility development
- enhancing interpretation/education and placing more of an emphasis on the park's resources as opposed to people issues in interpretation programs
- keeping the backcountry as natural as possible
- not attempting to meet all frontcountry camping needs in the park and emphasizing more rustic camping experiences
- maintaining the current slow-speed character of the Akamina and Red Rock parkways
- not making major changes to the park to accommodate tour buses
- minimizing conflicts between hikers and horse users, through means such as restrictions on group sizes, non-commercial outfitters and horse use on heavily-used hiking trails

Townsite

- maintaining the community's small town, low density character
- placing strict limits on expansion or not allowing any expansion
- developing strong architectural controls

Support Facilities

- improving the environmental and aesthetic quality of CPS facilities

Regional Integration

- placing a stronger emphasis on regional integration and taking a stronger stance on regional issues affecting the park
- playing a regional tourism role only to the extent that the national park mandate is not compromised

Section Two - Public Comments - Written Input

2.1 Resource Protection and Management

2.1.1 Physical Features and Biological Features (pp. 11 - 48)

Fifty-two respondents commented on this section. The comments can be categorized as follows:

# of respondents	Category and General Comments
18	Recommendations for park management included: - habitat maintenance is important for wildlife survival - concern for keeping areas in the most natural state possible - agree with the use of fire as a management tool - there is reference to the possibility of expanding the park boundaries or influence be yond the current boundaries in order to complete the eco systems of the park - enforce regulations
12	Support for protection of special features and greater environmental protection
8	Support and requests for education/interpretation. Comments included: educate the public on responsible action for human/wildlife encounters at the park
7	Additional information and/or corrections
6	Suggestions for further research and additions to the report
3	Compliments on the summary and research done
3	Other

Selected Quotes:

Very concerned about habituation of Bighorn sheep to humans in the townsite and Red Rock Canyon. This summer I witnessed tourists feeding animals at Red Rock, and sheep drinking at the townsite campsite. Educate the public, and more importantly enforce regulation or drop it!

Not mentioned among elk management concerns is the serious loss of habitat north of the Park due to poorly controlled access to mountain valleys along the East slope. This calls

for careful monitoring of elk habitat within the Park as well as habitat maintenance. The same applies to bighorn; a likely cause of the '82/83 dieoff is habitat-related stress that precipitated the disease outbreak (die-offs in Colorado in the 50s).

The Background Information document lists the Eskerine Complex and Blakiston Fan as ecologically sensitive areas yet the park does not give these areas the protection that they need both from physical disturbances and visual disturbances. I am speaking of the park storage area on the Blakiston fan - with a little care this could have been established out of sight and thus not cluttered one of the few big views of "Where the prairie meets the mountains". The other site that offers what could be a clear view of this phenomenon is at the north entrance of the park. Here the bison paddock obscures the unbroken exposure. The bison paddock is an obstruction in many ways, especially to the grazing of other ungulates such as elk and deer. It has a road that cuts through the Eskers that this complex is named after (with no interpretation about the eskers). There are unnatural trails cut on both sides of the fence that go straight up and down hills. It traps deer and elk that get into the paddock over snow drifts. It restricts the grazing of the bison in the same way that cows are restricted just north of the paddock outside of the park. All this in a biosphere reserve where the core area is supposed to be kept managed in the most natural way possible. My suggestion is that it is far more important to keep the eskerine complex in the most natural possible state than it is to interpret bison in an unnatural state.

This is an excellent summary of the value of Waterton Lakes . There is far more than I was aware of during my visits.

Protection of these features must be the primary consideration in all park management decisions. Visitor use of ecologically sensitive areas must be controlled as necessary.

The introductory statement to this section claims that "the features in this section are rare and of scientific value." The Lewis Overthrust is a prime example. It is suggested these facts be made known to the park's publics through a series of strategically located brass plaques. Costs for the project could be offset by the introduction of a "Friends of Waterton" program consisting of concerned users, citizens, corporations, etc. A marketing opportunity exists in capturing, photographically, the plants of Waterton Lakes National Park that are rare. A similar approach can be taken for the wildlife in the park.

Apart from creating some additional roadside pull-outs, no facility development should be allowed that disrupts the landscape, particularly unique features such as the depositional formations near the park entrance (Eskerines, etc.). No additional roads should be built anywhere, nor any expansion of the golf course be undertaken. I have enjoyed finding and photographing rare plants such as Kalmia polifolia (north shore, Summit Lake) and am concerned that one rider someday will unwittingly stomp out these rare occurrences of diminutive but significant high country species. People on foot may do the same of course, but I am convinced that horse traffic and the introduction of foreign nutrient material in horse droppings pose the greatest threat to Waterton's botanical community.

I applaud the willingness to use fire as a management tool to maintain grass communities in some areas that are quite moist. However, it must be borne in mind that fire reverses succession. (That is why it is a useful tool). Succession has been retarded in some parts of the eskerine complex (i.e. the tops of the eskers) by the drying effect of the wind. These areas are vegetated only by lichen, moss and club moss which represent the earliest stages of succession. In these areas fire would expose the soils, cause erosion and degrade the little soil there. I would recommend that fire not be used on these areas. The relatively low amount of disturbance in the drainages of the Park guarantee a reduced amount of flooding compared with what would be happening if they had all burned recently or been clear cut.

Regarding bear, I strongly recommend that you terminate all removal programs, relocation programs and that you only destroy bears that are terminally injured, ill, or extremely incorrigible disturbers of the peace. Replace those programs with education programs using aversion training as developed in Montana. This is far less expensive and it keeps bears that are otherwise smart.

Protection of natural processes must be the primary objective. Unique and easily endangered features (grizzly bears for example) must be left in their natural state.

The most recent threat by nature is via the tent caterpillars. Skeletons of trees and vegetation are now ripe for the next strike by nature - fire. We saw this devastate Yellowstone. Do we also sit back and just say "burn-baby-burn"? The real threat to nature could well be thinking "man"agement - not tourists.

The present park boundaries are arbitrary insofar as they are determined by political and economic parameters and not by physical or biological features. The park should be enlarged to at least its earliest largest size as an ongoing long term battle.

Are we managing a historic ecosystem or an evolving one? Two key components are missing - bison and controlled firing of the forest by natives. If we don't start to burn the aspen back, our grasslands will be gone within a few hundred years. (Unless the greenhouse effect gets us first). Waterton should have a staff "ecologist" like Glacier.

Considering that Waterton contains parts of ecosystems that are unique, sensitive and of important scientific value, the focus of park management should be on preservation and protection. Future plans should seek to include the complete ecosystems within park boundaries as plants and animals don't mark boundaries and need sufficient space to remain a healthy, functioning community.

2.1.2 Cultural Resources (pp. 49-72)

Responses

Thirty-eight respondents commented on this section. The comments can be categorized as follows:

# of respondents	Category and General Comments
13	Support the importance of preservation and need for more protection
9	Support and request more interpretation/education
6	Recommendations regarding management, such as suggestions for the preservation of native cultural resources, and development of cultural resources with interpretive trails, etc.
3	Natural resource protection must be considered over cultural resource protection
3	Comments or questions regarding Native role/relationship with Park. Comments included: - native involvement in the park's management decisions and programs should be increased
2	Provide more information
2	Compliments on section well done and interesting
3	Other

Selected Quotes:

My impression is that relations between the Peigan and Bloods, and the Park is one of confrontation, mistrust, and even disinterest. The Park is arguably "their" land, yet they do not participate meaningfully in the Park programs nor do they influence Park interpretation/management decisions. This should be identified as an issue and a well-planned effort made to resolve it. The Biosphere Association is one tool that could be used to improve communications.

I think this section was very well done but I do think the park has some hard decisions to make about its Euro-Canadian Architectural Sites. Is it more important to mention natural vistas or old buildings, such as the old kiosk? Also the structure at Oil City is inappropriate.

The park should supply more information on native use of the park and their interaction with nature. This would accomplish two things: increased contact between natives and whites would improve understanding and relations between the two groups; and the interpretive programs would point to a lifestyle that had considerably less impact on the park, and would help to increase awareness and thinking along these lines.

Incorporate a native artifact display at the Heritage Centre. The display at the centre is lacking (or is it ignoring?) this aspect of park history and cultural heritage.

Incorporate native interpretive programs with a native interpreter who visits ancient sites of interest that were important to ancient native peoples.

Cultural resources must not take precedence over natural resources. The Prince of Wales Hotel complex is a monument to man's arrogance and an eyesore (how about a 'controlled burn' approach?!).

Given the wealth of native history in the park, I am aware of very few interpretive opportunities. Usually the interpretive signs relate to geological features, which is great, but more information should be accessible to visitors regarding native history in the park. Obviously, it wouldn't be a good idea to identify the actual sites, but regions could be interpreted particularly with an emphasis on the balance between native culture and the park.

Native resources are interesting, but useless if nobody ever sees them.

Cultural resources are a much less important consideration than intelligent and dedicated preservation of park as wilderness and animal/wildlife refuge.

Didn't realize that Waterton has such a rich cultural history and so many archaeological sites. Are there any organized tours/walks of these areas? This could be of great interest to visitors and schools.

The Waterton area attracted early people because of its floral diversity, its relatively warm winters, and especially its wintering habitat for ungulates. Limited development of cultural resources with interpretive trails etc. would be in keeping with the park's mandate , in my opinion, and provide more recreational diversity for visitors.

It would be worthwhile to budget an amount each year to preserve or restore and set up informational signs at native and early white "sites" of various types. The proximity of the impressive "Head-Smashed-In" site and Albertans' desire to learn of historical aspects of our area makes this undertaking timely and worthwhile.

These sites, particularly native ones, grow more valuable as others are lost to agriculture, roads and mining etc. All Canadians need records of such sites as well as the sites them-

selves in order to appreciate our heritage and background.
Cultural resources are not being properly managed or interpreted. Witness what happened last June to the Emerald Bay site. ... Cultural resources are an integral part of the park. Inventories need completion and special status assigned to certain sites. Work with the native elders.

Measures should be taken to protect significant native habitation sites from human and environmental impacts. Possible consideration should be given to restoration of significant sites as well as kill sites and burial sites.

2.1.3 Resource Management Issues (pp. 89 - 100)

Responses

Fifty-nine respondents commented on this section. The comments can be categorized as follows:

# of respondents	Category and General Comments
54	Resource Management
	Wildlife Management
	- concern for the protection of the wildlife and their habitat (in particular bear and bear habitat protection)
	- concern for current and future habituation of wildlife to humans
	Vegetation Management
	- needs more attention in this planning program
	- studies and inventories of park vegetation need to be carried out
	- eliminate and prevent entrance of noxious weeds including water vege tation
	- rehabilitate and regenerate disturbed areas including the boundaries
	Biosphere
	- regeneration and protection of biodiversity is important
	- update or complete biological inventories
	Park Boundaries and International Border
	- regenerate both
	- expand boundaries to minimize commercial impact and provide a more complete ecosystem
	Fish Management
	- catch and release
	3 agreed
	3 opposed, wanting to keep the fish they catch
	2 opposed, wanting no fishing allowed
	- stocking lakes
	4 proposed stopping all stocking
	1 requested that it be carefully regulated

Fire Management
- there was general support for use of fire as a management tool, but division on strategy

Regional Integration
- Work with the government of Alberta to ensure resource protection
- do not expect to rely on regional cooperation but ensure the Canadian Parks Service's most important function is wildlife and resource protection

4 Interpretation/Education
- support for increased education and interpretation

6 Requested more information, posed questions or made corrections on documentation

5 Identified need for more research, for example:
- biological inventories and research
- study fire history
- Grizzly Bear research

Selected Quotes:

There was no mention of suspected causes of sheep-die-off. Were livestock implicated in pneumonia-lungworm complex? What about road kills in park? Preventative management is needed in the future.

We would call for more emphasis on wildlife management. As the grizzly bear situation is critical there is a tendency to focus on bear management. One paragraph was devoted to elk and virtually nothing to other forms of wildlife.

Grizzly Bear research should be of priority, given the species sensitivity to habitation and because it is one of the main aspects and delights of the park.

There has been quite a bit of information generated on population status and harvest management in the Grizzly Bear Management Plan prepared by the Alberta Fish and Wildlife Division. That information should be reviewed for the Waterton National Park Planning process.

In a national park, man should not be a predator of the wildlife, natural predators should take their rightful role here.

Keep people out of grizzly areas - they need the space more than people.

Strict enforcement of park policy with regards to feeding wildlife must occur. Agree that it is critical to preserve high quality habitat in an undisturbed state, guard the park for wildlife.

The main species needing management is homo sapiens. Wildlife habituation is an appalling problem in this park . Warden 'visibility' and heavy fines are probably the best remedies; education does not seem to work.

Study Poll Haven impact on the park and develop a plan with Alberta Forest to minimize or eliminate the impact on the park and wildlife especially the bear/cattle problems.

Work with the Blood Tribe to minimize development in the Timber Limit or to encourage low impact development suitable to the park.

Provide better education and enforcement of animal habituation. Develop a program to show harmful effects on animals of petting and feeding.

Ungulates especially become used to human contact and their predator/prey relationship becomes disturbed. Attempts at public education have had limited success . There needs to be a national/integrated (TV?) media campaign with a very high profile ; with the current interest in environment, funding should be available.

I have great doubts as to the effectiveness of the National Parks in upholding its laws when confronted by business interests - be it forestry, mining, etc. ... I cite the Lake O'Hara problem with the grizzly bear a few years back when the bear was harassed, at the park's expense, in an attempt to get it out of the area so that the lodge could run as usual. This is inappropriate. If there was no lodge there the trail would simply have been closed. Furthermore, surely this is a natural risk inherent with the lodge's location that the lodge owners must accept! However, the park seemed to bend to economic pressures versus protecting the interests of the wildlife and the land of which it is supposedly guardian. I would strongly support a much stronger, firmer stand by the parks!

Update vegetation resource information and study fire history to implement a sound program of vegetation management

Vegetation management is superficially treated. Questions such as woody encroachment and general deterioration of the Fescue Grasslands through lack of disturbance including fire are not mentioned. Livestock grazing in the park is occasionally requested. Does the new Parks Act preclude this ever happening again, or is grazing still an issue?

The knapweed control program must be continued and if necessary increased to prevent such proliferation as exists along the Glacier Park Chief Mountain - Logan Pass Highway.

Elimination of all exotic and noxious plant from the park without the use of chemicals. Plan to rehabilitate disturbed areas and reclamation of the same.

Again the Biosphere Association should be used to effectively "enlarge" the Park through more active participation of surrounding jurisdictions in the resolution of habitat-related problems. Research is needed, as you stated, but little attention is paid to baseline monitoring, a central Biosphere Reserve task. A major opportunity for habitat managers was missed when the Park failed to monitor the post-pine beetle vegetation damages along with the Alberta Forest Service.

Greater Waterton-Glacier ecosystem is important as noted! There should be more emphasis on biodiversity eg. native plants, song birds/habitat interactions.

Update, or complete biological inventories and research on all plant, animal and aquatic lifeforms in the park. Develop a program from these studies to protect and enhance plant and wildlife in the park.

The issue of climatic change, acid deposition ozone smog and the impacts on the ecosystem are not addressed. What is Waterton going to do to monitor change and minimize impacts on the plant/animal communities etc.? This issue is a must.

Let the border south regenerate but keep it well marked with signs and floating buoys in the lakes.

With reference to International Boundary Clearing, the Background Information document states: "It is felt a lack of an obvious boundary swath would emphasize the continuous landscape and de-emphasize the political boundary lending further significance to the Peace Park concept." What about Waterton's own park boundaries? The park boundary and road out from bison paddock to Oil Basin can be seen for at least 20 km. In many areas outside the park this is the only human mark on the landscape. Could this not be rehabilitated to allow for a continuous landscape between park and ranch land? I say this as a rancher who has long resented the park for scarring my view of what should be natural lands.

Discontinue boundary clearing and definitely discontinue use of chemicals on boundary. Should try and acquire more lands on the borders of the park to minimize commercial impact, especially to protect the grizzlies.

Difficult as there is not enough of a buffer zone. Conflicts with ranching are documented. As noted, ecosystems are not present in their entirety so species migrate out of the park. Bear conflicts by increased restriction and human encounter have been documented.

The return of Poll Haven to the park would provide more land for mammalian wildlife such as grizzly and elk. In the long run this would be more useful than for the number of cattle presently being raised. This would also be used as a camping area to increase these sites for urban populations.

All high lakes fishing should be on a catch and release basis.

In the case of fishing, the stocking programs have altered things so badly that you may as well make the best of a bad situation by going with "catch and release" recreation.

Strongly support changes in fish management, as suggested, to start us moving away from the idea that fish are an exception to the preservation rule. Severe catch limits, catch and release, artificial lures only, barbless hooks etc., should all be considered.

No stocking of trout or other fish to save native species and reduce chance of disease.

Fishing is not very compatible with park goals. I have the same objection as applies to hunting on land; it is not preservation.

I reject mandatory catch and release programs for high altitude lakes. This is a stupid idea and will bring about only enforcement problems while not contributing to fishstock. 90% of upper lakes have a good stock of fish. Only Bertha has a poor stock. Most fisherman release small fish as they catch them.

I can never understand why fishing is allowed in our parks when hunting (or picking flowers!) is not. Get rid of exotic fish species and protect the native ones (catch and release is a totally unnecessary form of cruelty).

I fully agree with the statements made by R. Watt (p. 94-95) and Schiefer (p. 95). It's long been apparent that more research was required on sportsfishing in the parks and the fisheries resources. Direct manipulation (such as Jasper sucker control program) should definitely be stopped and stocking should be carefully regulated and restricted to situations which meet management's objectives (i.e. "sportfishing will be managed to ensure the protection of aquatic ecosystems and the viability of native fish populations ... Efforts will also be made to provide visitors with realistic expectations of fishing opportunities in the park". Source: Jasper National Park Management Plan Summary, Nov. 1988.

A 'natural fire regime' plan is essential as soon as possible. Never mind the public 'visibility' problems, we have caused problems with long-term suppression and policies and must remedy them.

Strive to create a non-prescribed fire succession (i.e. you will first have to prescribe fire to gradually reduce the hazard, but the ultimate objective should be to allow natural wildfires to burn in many areas of the park).

I am all for fire management. One area that will have to be looked at is the forest along the trail to Goat Haunt. There is a lot of fuel there, one fire and a good wind puts the Waterton townsite in serious jeopardy. Controlled burning should be started very soon.

I am always concerned as to impact "management" of a problem. Normally, wildfires are a part of any ecosystem. Will selected fires provide the same benefit or will it backfire as did the introduction of rabbits in Australia?

The Canadian Parks Service should manage Waterton on a worst-case basis in terms of regional resource "cooperation" which may not be what the Service hopes. Wildlife protection in particular should be the most important guiding factor in all habitat management. This park and neighbouring Glacier may well be all there is for some species in the next few years in this part of the Rockies.

I would like to see the park exert stronger pressure on the Alberta government to observe the Eastern Slopes Policy (i.e. Castle River logging). It is a very difficult task to maintain a balance between visitor use and resource protection. It is preferable to err on the side of resource protection. It is very disturbing to read that there are only 20-25 grizzlies using the park. Pressure should be brought to bear on adjacent lands.

With all that is going on in the park as compared to all the pressures around the park, it is amazing that the park still even exists.

Much more research is needed into most park resources. Without information, how can the management goals be achieved?

2.2 Visitor Activities and Facilities

2.2.1 Water-based Activities (pp. 105-118)

Sixty-four respondents commented on water-based activities.

What water-based activities are appropriate in Waterton Lakes National Park?

Forty-nine respondents commented on this question. The responses tended to address the water-based activities that were thought to be inappropriate. Concerns focused on motorized activities.

Motorboats:	14 said no
	13 said they should be carefully controlled (ie. as now, speed limits, boat size limits)

Not allowing motorboats or limiting size and speed will automatically exclude parasailing and waterskiing, and many respondents recognized and supported this.

Parasailing: 16 said no

Waterskiing: 11 said no

Water sl idoos: 3 said no

Scuba diving: 5 said yes, allow
1 said no.

There were suggestions for controls, such as requiring licenses of operators, restricting areas for scuba diving, etc.

Sailboarding/windsurfing: 5 said yes
1 said no.

There were suggestions for controls, such as not allowing races, requiring licenses of operators, restricting areas for sailboarding, etc.

Four respondents thought that current regulations are appropriate.

Is there a need to improve facilities and services for appropriate water-based activities? Suggestions?

Twenty-nine respondents commented on this question, with suggestions ranging from expanding the marina to eliminating docking facilities for motorized boats.

Expand Facilities: 9 respondents
- expand, upgrade docks
- add facilities for divers, sailboarders, scuba divers if necessary
- washrooms open year round

As is: 12 respondents
- adequate as is
- do not expand, but do add sewage dump facilities
- repair

Reduce: 3 respondents
- eliminate docking facilities for motorized boats
- eliminate boating concession at Cameron Lake

Do you feel management actions are necessary to minimize conflicts among different water-based activities? Suggestions?

Sixteen respondents commented on possible management actions. Suggestions included use zones, permit systems, information provision (signs, brochures, training workshops or videos),

and enforcement of regulations. There was not a significant level of concern expressed for the need to minimize conflicts.

What level of monitoring and emergency response should the park provide for water-based activity participants?

Nineteen respondents had suggestions about monitoring and emergency response:

- 2 thought this was not the responsibility of the Park
- 4 believed minimal search and rescue capabilities were needed

  Suggestions included:
  - registration
  - increase the number of park wardens
  - have a regular patrol
  - monitor one CB channel for boaters
  - have an emergency communication system

What information would help you to safely enjoy water-based activities in the park?

Seven respondents commented on the information that would be of benefit:

- 6 mentioned the need for information on hazards and safety (including water conditions, regulations, emergency procedures, etc.)
- 2 noted a need to inform windsurfers and scuba divers of guidelines and safety concerns more effectively

Selected Quotes:

> *I think all activities presently allowed are acceptable with the exception of parasailing. Also motorboat use must be closely monitored. Maybe leave the washrooms open year round for everybody. It may become necessary to designate areas for diving and sailboarding. I do not believe it is wise or necessary to provide a lot of funding for monitoring and emergency response for waterbased activities.*
>
> *Keep Cameron Lake free of powerboats. The lake cruises/tours are very good, especially for seniors and families. Facilities should certainly be built, if needed, to accommodate divers and sailboard users. Without proper facilities, the beaches will become polluted and perhaps, an embarrassing place to be for other users. Congestion of sailboarders, tour boats and other boats near the townsite should be settled by those using the lake but governed by navigational regulations.*
>
> *I find the noise of an outboard (or other) motor on a boat a real intrusion into the environment of the park. They also create a smell and fuel slicks on the water. Other watercraft*

and activities are okay if they place no demands on the park's staff or budget. I don't see how they help you with your primary mandate; conservation.

Appropriateness is difficult to determine when looking at activities such as parasailing, jetskiing and even sailboarding. At present the best policy may be to discourage them by not providing facilities - i.e. rentals etc. Motors should be restricted to the middle and upper lakes. Whether boats should be permitted in the Maskinonge during bird breeding should be looked at. Existing facilities are adequate. Users must take responsibility for their own safety.

Maintain existing docking facilities. There should be no scuba diving in the marina area. Add sewage dump facilities for "portapotties". Holding tanks on boats should be disallowed. Warden service should monitor one specific CB Radio channel for boaters. Limit the number of sailboarders in preferred areas at any one time.

Upgrading services (such as more and larger docking facilities) will only lead to a call for still more developed services. Water based activities which do not require extensive development and do not lead to use conflicts should be encouraged. Activities such as waterskiing, parasailing etc. are not appropriate in a national park.

Activities on the water should be restricted to traditional uses and any new fad or sport should be restricted. There are enough lakes and reservoirs outside the park to accommodate high profile sports such as parasailing. The people who come to enjoy Waterton should be able to enjoy the park in its natural state.

Restrict powerboats as per existing plans.

Do not increase facilities to accommodate increases in demand. The protection of the park should be foremost in planning. How much do you continue to expand to accommodate bigger boats?

Discontinue sailboard competitions and move them outside the park. Sporting events have no place within a national park.

Install a boat sewage dump to help eliminate dumping in the lake.

Purchase fuel spill recovery equipment for the marina and put a plan in place for fuel recovery. Bill the polluter for the cost of the clean-up.

Scuba diving parking, suit up area etc. should be moved away from the water's edge and size of groups should be controlled to minimize impact on the park. How big do you allow groups to get?

Conduct an Environmental Impact Assessment of powerboat use on Waterton Lake.

Install a catch basin for storm sewers emptying into the lake to catch oil and gas run off from streets.

How nice it would be if all power boats except for tour boat and warden patrols could be banned! Waterskiing should not be allowed in the park. No parasailing. These activities are incompatible with the concept of wilderness protection and understanding and spoil the experience for other users as well as causing pollution.

I foresee an increase in kayaking and an opportunity to develop this sport particularly with the increase in energy costs and the focus on healthy activity based sports. I view this as an appropriate water-based activity along with canoeing but not powerboating. Scuba diving should be promoted more. Sinking another boat at a destination of choice by the park management would create another dive destination and alleviate the congestion problem currently faced at Emerald Bay. The facilities and services improvements necessary are minimal as outlined and could be implemented at little cost. I do not feel management action is necessary to minimize conflicts among different water based activities.

Education and promotion of the responsibilities of users is sufficient to create awareness. The question of monitoring and emergency response could have serious ramifications if not properly addressed. The logical approach would be to provide a brief training seminar to users prior to use of the lake (whether scuba, sailboarders, boaters, etc.) on the issue of what to do in the event of an accident. Quite impractical from the park's point of view with limited staff and budget. The practical option would be a professionally done video which would be required viewing prior to use of facilities.

As with other forms of recreation, the needs of the wildlife and the botanical integrity of the park have to be placed ahead of any recreational use of the park waters.

This is a small park and it should be oriented toward providing a wilderness based experience, since no other areas in southern Alberta can do that. On the other hand, all motorized activities that would be excluded from (phased out of) the park can be done in virtually all of Alberta. The immense natural beauty of the park provides the only opportunity in southern Alberta for natural experiences, particularly compared to adjacent areas heavily marked by the hands of human industry. Eliminate private storage facilities at Cameron Lake. Preferential treatment? Eliminate the boating concession at Cameron Lake to provide for a wilderness boating experience (in conjunction with road de-commissioning). The existing operation is a garish display of inappropriate use and commercialism of a park environment.

I would much prefer Cameron if the entire rental boat business was taken out, docks included, and only use of private canoes and rowboats permitted.

There is ample opportunity outside Federal Parks for motorized boating. Row boats, canoes and other water activities could be enjoyed without the noise, oil and gas pollution

and danger created by motorboats. Information on the lakes, possible weather changes and the need to be alert in case of sudden change should be emphasized.

Many years ago there was a warden at the dock who could advise and enforce regulations i.e. speeding in Emerald Bay. There is also a need for an upper speed limit on boats and noise limit.

2.2.2 Backcountry Hiking and Camping (pp. 119 - 140)

Seventy-two respondents commented on backcountry hiking and camping.

Does the range of backcountry opportunities currently provided in Waterton Lakes National Park meet your needs and expectations?

Twenty-seven respondents commented on backcountry opportunities:

- 11 thought the range currently provided is good
- 3 thought the first priority should be on protecting and managing the resources, rather than providing visitor opportunities
- 3 thought that there is no backcountry, few wildland opportunities in Waterton.

Do you feel management actions are necessary to reduce conflicts among different backcountry user groups (eg. hikers, horse users, bicyclists, day and overnight users)?

Twenty-four respondents commented on this question:

- 5 supported separate routes for horses, hikers, cyclists
- 4 concerned with impacts of horses and/or bikes
- 3 said no action necessary
- 3 said need action
- 3 said a traffic code, and courtesy are needed
- 1 opposed separated trails
- 6 wanted restrictions on horses
- 1 said do not allow horses
- 4 wanted restrictions on bikes
- 1 said do not allow bikes
- 1 said no dogs

What facilities are appropriate in the backcountry of Waterton Lakes National Park?

Seventeen respondents commented on what facilities are appropriate in the backcountry:

- 7 wanted some structures, but limited to privies, tent pads and fire pits
- 4 wanted minimal structures (the fewer the better)

- 3 thought facilities are adequate as is
- 1 supported more shelters

Are park trails constructed and maintained to a suitable standard?

Sixteen respondents commented on this question:

- 10 respondents thought the trails were well maintained
- 1 respondent thought there should be no new trails, and use should be monitored
- 5 commented on trail maintenance. The concerns included:
    - trail maintenance was too visible
    - trails were excessively wide
    - no need to mow low vegetation on trail sides
    - better maintenance was needed

Do you support the construction of roofed accommodation facilities (alpine huts, shelters or lodges) in the backcountry?

Thirty-two respondents commented on roofed accommodation:

- 22 opposed roofed accommodation facilities
- 2 said structures should be limited to minimal shelter
- 3 suggested removing some decrepit buildings
- 3 suggested maintain existing buildings but do not add more
- 2 supported constructing more shelters

Do you see a need to change the backcountry campground reservation system? Suggestions?

Twenty respondents commented on the backcountry reservation system:

- 10 advocated some form of advance registration
- 1 said do not allow reservations far in advance
- 3 discussed use of permits, to limit numbers
- 6 said no changes were needed
- 1 said only allow small groups - no large groups

Should horse and hiker parties be separated at backcountry campgrounds?

Seventeen respondents commented on horse and hiker parties in backcountry campgrounds:

- 10 supported separated campgrounds
- 1 suggested separating horses and hikers just enough for proper positioning of corrals
- 1 said horse parties should not be allowed overnight
- 2 suggested restricting horses to more remote sites
- 1 thought there were no conflicts
- 1 said horses were OK
- 2 said do not separate horses and hikers

Should campground quotas be varied according to site capabilities and visitor needs?

Twenty-three respondents commented on campground quotas:

- 3 said vary by site and usage
- 12 said vary by site capabilities, but not by visitor demand
- 2 supported the present system
- 1 said increase slightly to meet visitor needs
- 1 thought quotas should be low and strictly enforced
- 1 thought some quotas could be lowered, but do not raise any

Would you support the closure of backcountry campgrounds that are in environmentally sensitive areas or are used infrequently?

Thirty-five respondents commented on the closure of backcountry campgrounds:

- 7 supported closure of campgrounds that are environmentally sensitive or used infre quently.
- 20 supported closure for campgrounds that are environmentally sensitive, but not for infrequent use
- 4 suggested moving and upgrading campgrounds, rather than closing any
- 4 suggested opening other campgrounds if some are closed

Do you feel that there is a need for additional backcountry campgrounds or campsites? If so in what locations?

Twelve respondents commented on the need for additional campgrounds:

- 7 opposed any new campgrounds
- 1 supported closing overused sites, but providing replacements
- 2 supported new campgrounds
- 2 suggested a few more campsites

Do you have any comments on the design and level of service of backcountry campgrounds in Waterton Lakes National Park?

Fifteen respondents commented on the design and level of service of backcountry camp-grounds. Three thought things were good. Other comments included:

- requests for appropriate camp pads
- more frequent cleaning
- more careful design and planning
- suggestion for metal cable and clip-type food storage set-ups
- belief that backcountry campgrounds should be as basic as possible

Do you have any concerns about prohibiting open fires at some/all backcountry campgrounds?

Forty respondents commented on prohibiting open fires:

- 17 supported prohibiting fires
- 3 supported encouraging use of stoves instead of fires
- 8 said strictly control fires (eg. not during dry conditions, only at certain sites, etc.)
- 2 supported allowing fires only where firewood can be provided
- 1 thought need to supply firewood (eg. for emergencies, such as hypothermia)
- 2 thought firewood should be paid for by users
- 3 thought firewood should be provided
- 3 supported fires
- 1 suggested allowing fires if hikers bring their own wood

Do you have any comments about the quality and availability of backcountry information?

Twelve respondents commented on backcountry information:

- 2 respondents thought current information is good
- 4 respondents suggested improving trail signs
- 2 respondents asked for no more information or trail signs
- 1 respondent thought information was poor because Information Centre staff were not knowledgeable
- other respondents made suggestions for more information, including a mandatory video for novices, interpretive hikes, and more education overall

Selected Quotes:

Having hiked in the area often for 10 years, generally the trails and camps are exemplary. Current needs and expectations are quite well met. Absolutely opposed to additional roofed accommodation facilities, rationale being the small size of the park. Strongly support closure
of backcountry camps that are environmentally sensitive. No more camps or campsites? Trail signs should be improved and be more consistent and accurate.
One should be able to reserve a backcountry site sooner than one night prior (or at least have a proportion available for reservation).

Range of opportunities is good. Go to use of stoves only - no fires - at backcountry campsites. Park staff time and budget should not be used for provision of firewood. Backcountry campsites should be designed better. Sides of trails are cut back too much. Often the very wildflowers we are hiking to see have been hacked back, mowed down several feet.

Remove some of the decrepit buildings that are there now! eg. Bertha Lake. We do not support construction of roofed facilities.

Horse parties should be separated at campsite from backpackers only enough so that corrals are an adequate distance from tents. Corrals and areas used to saddle and unsaddle horses should be located so that a hiker need not watch where he puts his feet down when entering or leaving a backcountry campsite.

The range of backcountry opportunities does meet my needs. Management actions are definitely needed to reduce conflicts between hikers and trail cyclists. Trails and designated campsites (equipped with some or all of the following: privies, tent pads, fire pits, bear poles) are the only facilities we should have in the backcountry. I do not support the construction of roofed accommodation facilities, because of maintenance requirements, abuse of such facilities and changes to the character of the natural area in which they are placed.

Horse parties should not be permitted to camp overnight in the backcountry due to heavy impacts, trampling, grazing, and horse manure.

Allowing reservations far in advance is not needed and would result in unused backcountry reservations.

Some campground quotas could be lowered but do not raise any beyond the current level. We are fortunate that Waterton does not yet have any of the "mega-campgrounds" seen in the backcountry of other national parks.

I support the closure of some campgrounds

A designated campsite with a very small quota should be developed at Lineham Lakes, rather than the random camping scheme currently in use. This would concentrate the impacts to a limited area. No other additional backcountry campsites are needed.

I support prohibiting open fires at some or all backcountry campsites.

Information is poor because none of the staff at the Information Centre ever seem to have hiked more than ten feet from the road.

Backcountry facilities should be developed only so far as to alleviate environmental damage; i.e. designated tent pads in designated sites.

Opportunities are good to excellent. There needs to be a reduction in horse use on some trails eg. Bertha Lake, Alderson Lake.

Cyclists should be required to have and use bells.

Backcountry facilities should be minimal; trails are excellent. The park is too small to require roofed accommodation in the backcountry. Backcountry campground quotas should be low and strictly enforced. There should be no overnight camping or horse access at Crypt Lake.

Besides semi-primitive, primitive and wildlands the zoning and sensitive site classifications must be considered. Site rehabilitation must be a high priority. The rate of degradation/disregard/abuse increases as site quality (previous degradation) decreases. Quotas should be based on site capacities, and should vary not only between sites, but at particular sites over a season if appropriate. Rotation sites out of use for rehabilitation should also be considered.

Fires should be facilitated. We need a way to charge for consumption i.e. firewood if it is expensive.

At campsites where wood burning stoves are provided, firewood should be kept in good supply. Updating campsites to clearly show where tents should be pitched etc. would improve the enjoyment of the backcountry.

Highest priority should be put on "managing the resource". Where heavy use requires change or more intensive development, the best management practice should be used even if it reduces "experience" satisfaction.

Hikers should have priority over horse-users and bicyclists (hikers have less of an impact).

I do support closure of environmentally sensitive areas.

Fire should be prohibited at all backcountry campgrounds.

I concur with the planner's statement that accessibility to the backcountry means there are few wildland opportunities remaining in the park. The most significant intrusions are the two highways that dissect the park from East to West. If these two highways were phased out the wildland quality of the park would be greatly enhanced. I think the objective of this plan should be primarily to reclaim and preserve every bit of wilderness the park has and can have.

I would like to see a traffic code established for the hiking trails regarding right of way and rules for meeting and passing between horse users and hikers. From my experience as an outfitter using sections of the park trails, I have found hikers to be exceptionally courteous to us and have never in the past decade had any problem meeting or passing them. Bicycles on the other hand have surprised us suddenly a few times, which can be dangerous for novice horse riders. One thing I would not like to see is more trails established to operate both groups. I think it is important to keep human activity to one trail.

It is disappointing to arrive at the alpine lakes and meadows and be greeted by outhouses, horses corrals and cabins in some places. The shelter at Twin Lakes is an eyesore with its graffiti. I don't think it is necessary. People using the backcountry should be self-sustaining. The corrals are practical but ... I would prefer a cable to tie to, strung through the trees somewhere away from the lake or meadow. This could be moved to allow reclamation.

Leave the backcountry wild. We can see and make use of development virtually everywhere outside of the park. Wilderness is a scarce and precious commodity.

2.2.3 Frontcountry Camping (pp. 141 - 159)

Sixty-nine respondents commented on frontcountry camping.

To what extent should the Canadian Parks Service attempt to meet camping demand during peak periods?

Thirty-five respondents commented on camping demand:

- 6 thought the park should meet camping demand
- 20 thought the park should not meet camping demand
- 7 suggested implementing a reservation system
- 5 suggested shortening the length of stay
- 3 thought current facilities are adequate

Should more camping opportunities be provided in the park or should demand be met outside the park?

Forty-four respondents commented on providing additional camping opportunities:

- 31 thought demand should be met outside the park
- 3 thought demand should be met inside the park
- 4 suggested using existing overflow within the park
- 1 suggested redesigning existing campgrounds to increase capacity
- 1 suggested the park acquire more land to meet demand
- 7 opposed any development in the park

What range of camping experiences do you think should be provided in Waterton Lakes National Park?

Seventeen respondents commented on camping experiences:

- 8 thought the range should be limited
- 7 thought it should be unlimited (as is)
- 10 thought no change was needed

Should the park attempt to respond to changing trends or provide for certain types of camping only?

Twenty-two respondents commented on the need to respond to changing trends:

- 6 supported responding to changing trends
- 10 opposed it
- 2 supported if it is compatible with the park's mandate

Two opposed providing only certain types of camping, while fourteen supported providing certain types only:

- 6 said tents only
- 4 tents and RVs, but separated
- 7 said no RVs
- 8 supported rustic camping

What level of service should be provided at park campgrounds? At individual campgrounds?

Twenty-eight respondents commented on the level of service at campgrounds:

- 9 said there was a need to keep services and facilities basic
- 6 said the park must limit the number of services and facilities
- 15 said there was a need to improve existing services and facilities
- 3 thought there was a need for more full-service facilities

Should the park increase shoulder-season and winter camping services? To what extent?

Twenty-three respondents commented on shoulder-season and winter camping:

- 14 in support
- 9 in opposition
- 1 thought there should be no winter camping
- 1 said service must be rustic.

Would you support partial or full privatization of Waterton Lakes National Park campgrounds?

Forty respondents commented on privitization:

- 5 supported full privitization
- 10 supported partial privitization
- 23 opposed privitization
- 2 thought they needed more information

Selected Quotes:

Design sites so RV campers are lumped together - they can understand each others needs when their generators are on.
More patrols, evictions, charges and arrests as necessary are needed in the campgrounds. Currently there are few patrols, but lots of noise and parties. Maybe hire more summer wardens. Don't be shy to lay charges!

If you have to use a lottery system, fine, but reservation systems are unfair, as there are those who drop off their equipment and come back later.

I do not camp, but in any of the parks it is obvious there are going to have to be rules. Reservation systems are going to become a must. I do not think it necessary to have different campsites or different types. I like the idea of tents as everyone cannot afford RVs and there should be good tent sites set up with good washrooms etc.

No privatization

I believe an attempt to partially meet peak demand (say 90%) should be made. Encourage private campgrounds outside the park to provide a more park-like experience for visitors. I do not believe the park should try to meet every trend (i.e. RVs). Encourage this outside the park.

I strongly disagree with privatization of any park services or facilities.

Shoulder-season and winter camping services should be rustic but firewood, water and toilets must be available in adequate amounts.

Parks Canada should influence - perhaps through the Biosphere Association - the location and development of camping facilities outside the Park. The Park experience begins outside the Park and off Park facilities can enhance a visitor's enjoyment of the Park.

Demand should be met outside the park first during peak periods. But should be monitored closely to provide back up. Congratulations to Parks Canada for the best campgrounds in the country in Waterton Park.

To keep it as basic as possible for the least cost for the public, but make sure that the user pays for the service. The user costs should be able to cover the cost of the service and maintenance costs.

These campgrounds are often the only way some visitors, especially families, get a chance to stay in the park and thus are able to become familiar with a park's environment. The only facilities needed at these campgrounds are adequate water and sewage systems, including showers. Rather than "full hook-ups" ; I feel it would be more appropriate for

Parks Canada to provide more interpretive facilities; let's get people to leave their TVs at home, and to look at the park!

The trend toward "full service" camping is contributing to the decline of our national parks, since it entails the paving over of extensive areas, building of facilities, overcrowding of roads, vehicular air pollution, and ever-decreasing public environmental awareness. Instead of just going with the trend, the Canadian Parks Service should be taking the lead role in promoting a return to lower-impact, rustic camping experiences. Phase out the full-hookup paved parking lots, except perhaps for senior citizens, and start encouraging people to tent camp.

The park should not increase shoulder season or winter camping services until such time as revenue collection from these activities would cover maintenance and staffing costs.

Frontcountry camping should be expanded; more full service sites in the townsite and more unserviced in Crandell and Belly River to make up for the extra serviced sites in the townsite. There are more and more who need full service sites.

I'm in favour of privatization in the campgrounds if it is long term and the park enforces a quality control program so there is no reduction in quality.

I agree with the planner's rationale on page 144 of the background document. There is a desire to maintain the park in its present state and facilities should not be constructed only to meet peak demand as that is no doubt exponential with population growth. The towns and communities around the parks are searching for sustainable economic development and most of them are already developed to handle and provide services for motorized campers. I would like to see the park provide for primitive camping only. I don't feel there is enough wilderness left in southern Alberta and people will look to the national parks for the last opportunities to find wilderness and primitive camping.

Support partial privatization but feel contact between park staff and visitors on a personal basis is important for both sides.

2.2.4 Sightseeing, Picnicking and Strolling (Leisure Activities) (pp. 159 - 174)

Sixty-two respondents commented on sightseeing, picnicking, and strolling.

Do you think adequate information and interpretation is being provided to visitors undertaking sightseeing, picnicking and strolling activities? Do you have any suggestions for improvements?

Twenty-six respondents replied to this question:

- 11 thought more information and interpretation is needed

- 10 thought current information and interpretation is adequate
- 5 thought information and interpretation is needed as educational tools for visitors

Do you feel there are sufficient pull-offs and signs for sightseers along park roads?

Twenty-two respondents commented on the number of pull-offs and signs:
- 4 said more pull-offs are needed
- 3 thought more signs are needed
- 6 thought more pull-offs and signs are needed
- 4 thought the current situation is adequate
- 1 suggested better pull-offs and signs
- 2 suggested encouraging public transportation and discouraging car use

Do you have any thoughts on the future of the Akamina and Red Rock Parkways? To what extent should they be upgraded?

Twenty-three respondents commented on the Akamina and Red Rock Parkways:
- 14 thought they should not be upgraded - are currently adequate
- 3 said they should be improved
- 6 thought Red Rock should be improved
- 2 thought Akamina should be improved
- 3 suggested closing one or both

Do you have any comments or concerns about picnic facilities in Waterton Lakes National Park?

Eighteen respondents commented on picnic facilities:
- 8 thought current facilities are adequate
- 5 thought more facilities are needed (such as picnic shelters)
- 3 suggested improving quality, not quantity
- 3 were concerned with specific areas

To what extent should the needs of bus tours be met in Waterton Lakes National Park?

Nineteen respondents commented on meeting the needs of bus tours:
- 1 thought they should be met
- 4 thought they should be met, but conforming with the park's mandate
- 11 believed the needs of bus tours should not be met
- 4 thought needs are adequately met now
- 3 suggested encouraging other uses (such as public transportation)
- 4 thought needs should be met outside the park

Do you have any comments or concerns about the park's short walking and strolling trails?

Eleven respondents had other comments and concerns:

- 4 thought no changes are needed
- 5 suggested improving/completing existing trails
- 2 suggested developing new trails

Selected Quotes:

Some picnic areas (Emerald Bay, Maskinonge) are deteriorating because vehicles are allowed to drive on the grass. Low, rustic pole fences could be used to demarcate driving areas. Parks should not be places to go for manmade facilities and "entertainment". We've already seen what this approach has done to Banff. Waterton does not need more bus tours. A number of picnic shelters could be removed, such as some of those at Cameron Bay and alongside the townsite campground.

The Red Rock and Akamina Parkways should not be upgraded, only repaved if required. Their role as scenic motorways should be emphasized. Picnic facilities are adequate other than around the townsite. Agree that the development of short loop trails should be looked at, eg. Crandell Lake from the Campground, the lower slopes of Galwey from Crandell Campground, the old YWCA road.

Interpretation information is not adequate, but it is a question of what can be afforded. There is a need for Eco-tour bulletins.There is a greater need for a park museum which will tie the whole thing together.There are great research needs to provide information for park interpretation - on the other hand there has been outstanding archaeological research (great report in this bulletin!) which has not found its way to public interpretation.

Akamina and Red Rock Roads should be maintained as at present but with a few more pull-offs at scenic spots. Complete the walking loop from Narrows-Linnet and back to Emerald Bay, using the old trail below the power generating building - no horses or bicycles.

Easily available, concise information on park attractions and services is important and should be provided at the entrance of the park and at all popular stopping points eg. town center, campground etc. Clean signage is very important. Major roadways must be upgraded to handle demand. Use of intermediate points along major roads should be encouraged to avoid the tendency to rush from one popular (and overcrowded) point to the next.

Waterton should be spared the bus tour pattern which is turning other parks i.e. Banff and Jasper into zoos. Waterton should develop its image as a non-commercial, hiking oriented park.

Better signing. Pulloffs in prime areas need expanding. More individual picnic sites might help in some areas.

Now you have made an unpleasant raceway of the entrance road, and until managers drive that road as much as I do they won't see that it has ruined part of the character of Waterton. The Akamina Parkway is quite satisfactory as it is . Pullouts are adequate. Close the Red Rock Parkway to vehicle traffic before some development-hungry engineer decides we need 60 mile per hour traffic on what is now an attractive, friendly, scenic low-speed road. Chief Mountain Highway is an example of road building overkill to accommodate a relatively light traffic flow even in summer. Strolling and walking trails are very satisfactory as is. Picnic areas are good, except the roads across the Blakiston Fan are quite unsightly. The bison paddock does not show bison in their original setting. I suggest removing penned bison from the park. The marina is a costly and unsightly expense to the park. Remove it. Let day use canoes and rowboats launch from a restored shoreline.

Yes, information and interpretation are adequate. Picnic facilities are just right and always have been a very popular part of the day use of Waterton.

No bus tour accommodations in areas of Waterton with limited space; Cameron Falls for example. The worst of the diesel tour bus scene is that drivers seem incapable of shutting off the engine, so that roar, smoke and stink hang around attractions that should be visited quietly in clean air. I have enjoyed time and time again the short walking trails in the park. But no bicycles and no dogs on them.

Through printed literature, signs and whatever interpretive means possible, visitors should be made aware of rules protecting the flora and fauna of the park. Pets should not be on trails, but if they must be they should be on a leash at all times. People need to be aware that these regulations are for their protection as well as the parks. Provide more pull-offs and signs for special attractions. Visitors should be discouraged from Red Rock canyon if they are causing damage.

Adequate info is being given. No upgrading of Akamina or Red Rock Canyon roadways. Bicycle trails should be built along and close to but not on them. Picnic facilities are good. Small buses should be used for drop off of hikers to Cameron Lake, Red Rock Canyon etc. The short trails are good.

2.2.5 Horse Use (pp. 175-186)

Seventy-two respondents commented on horse use.

Do you have any comments on the level and types of resource impacts associated with horse use in Waterton Lakes National Park?

Forty-one respondents commented on resource impacts associated with horse use:

Impacts:
- 34 said yes
- 4 said no

Level of Impacts:
- 13 said high
- 5 said low
- 2 said moderate

Types of Impacts:
- 6 mentioned horse droppings
- 8 mentioned braiding/erosion

Respondents commented that the areas most impacted upon were Blakiston fan, grassland/aspen forest, and steep trails at high elevations.

Are limits required on non-resident outfitter use of the park?

Thirty-four respondents commented on limits on non-resident outfitter use of the park:
- 22 thought there should be limits
- 4 said no limits
- 4 supported phasing out non-resident outfitters
- 5 thought more monitoring is needed
- 9 suggested a license or permit

Should limits be set on horse group size for day use? What limit do you feel would be appropriate?

Forty-two respondents commented on limits to horse group size:
- 39 supported limiting size
- 2 thought limits are not necessary

Most appropriate size:
- 2 said less than six
- 13 said up to six
- 7 said up to ten
- 7 said over ten

Do you support horse use restrictions on certain park trails?

Fifty-two respondents commented on horse use restrictions:

- 39 thought restrictions are needed
- 10 thought no restrictions were needed
- 3 supported eliminating horse use on the trails
- 16 commented on the need to minimize and/or separate horse/hiker trails
- the most commonly mentioned areas for restrictions: Bertha Lake (7) and Crypt Lake (4)
- 3 supported restrictions but not on wardens

What facilities should be provided for horse users in the park? Where?

Nineteen respondents commented on facilities for horse users:

- 3 thought more facilities must be provided
- 7 thought present facilities are adequate
- 11 said existing facilities must be improved (suggestions include hitching rails, designated horse trails, corrals, high line cable instead of corrals)

Selected Quotes:

Definitely set limits on group size, very hard on trails during wet days. Suggested size - 5-6. Horses should be forbidden on the highest use hiking trails only, otherwise, they have right to be on the trails if they don't abuse the backcountry.

The Blakiston Fan area is being ruined by excessive use and continual development of new informal trails. Something should be done.

Limits on the number of horses in a group should be enforced on trails that have high hiker/horse usage. Limits should definitely be in place where horses and hikers share the backcountry campsites. I also agree with limits on the size of hiking parties.

Indiscriminate use of horses within a several kilometre radius of Alpine Stables has devastated much of Waterton's unique grassland and aspen forest ecosystems. The activities of the horse concession should be severely curtailed.

It is ridiculous that the horse concession is allowed to use such major hiking trails as Bertha Lake, Crypt Lake and the Alderson-Carthew trail for its trail rides. Waterton should take its lead from Glacier Park, Montana, where horse use is severely restricted and hiker-horse user conflicts are rare. I would, however, support fewer restrictions on private horse users, who are far fewer in number; this would allow area residents to enjoy their traditional use of the park. Horse parties should not be allowed to camp within Waterton's

backcountry, due to the obvious impacts (Lone Lake, for example). Use of the park by other outfitters is not a reasonable proposition at this time, given the tremendous impact throughout the park. Horses should not be permitted within grassland areas of the park because the temptation is too great to ride off-trail. (eg. Eskerine Complex, Horseshoe Basin - Oil Basin). Horse users should be provided with a few hitching rails on some designated horse trails.

I support horse use restrictions on some trails. Limits are required on non-resident outfitters. Only small groups should be allowed (5-6 horses).

Most trails should be closed to horses! Restrict private horse use ; it is unfair to other types of users in this small park. Could be encouraged outside park.

Horses should be strictly controlled on all trails, banned from others. The staging area and Wall Lake/Akimina Pass trailhead should be redeveloped for better parking of horse trailers. Paid permits should be required for all "out of park" outfitters who come to use this area.

Table 1 makes it obvious that if any horse use should be phased out in the park it should be the commercial operation of Alpine Stables. I have been a user of private horses in the park all my life. I do not see private horse use as a problem as it now stands. The 1978 review alleviated some of the backcountry problems. Waterton's small size makes overnight horse camping in the backcountry almost unnecessary. ... For horsemen especially, I wish Waterton would build a trail down the Boundary Creek Valley completely within Waterton.

I do not think Waterton is large enough to accommodate an in-Park horse outfitter travelling the backcountry. I do believe that outfitters residing and licensed in Alberta or British Columbia should be allowed free travel across the west park trails, except during the hunting season. Use of the Castle River Divide, Sage Pass, South Kootenay Pass and Akamina Pass trails would make commercial outfitting much more of a viable business on the north and west sides of Waterton, where the original beautiful scenery has been so abused by extractive industries. There should be a limit to horse user group size for day use in the park. My experience tells me that as many as 25 horses and riders can go through Waterton without harm if they are an outfitted group just passing through. But for fishing and scenic in-park use, where some park feature is the destination, then I believe, once again based on experience, that 10 should be maximum and 5 more desirable. Present horse use facilities at trailheads are adequate. But the corrals in the backcountry are not good. Corralled horses will fight and tear up equipment. Out of sight hitch rails are best. The corral in the Rowe Basin is the worst of all. I do not support closure or failure to maintain the beautiful trail leading from Beebe Flats on the Blood Indian Timber Limit up the North Fork of Belly River. If there is a problem with the Blood Tribe, then re-route the lower end of the trail to pass by the timber limit somewhere along its west boundary and cut the new trail to intersect the old one on the North Fork.

2.2.6 Winter Activities (pp. 187-198)

Two questions were asked regarding winter activities:

Do you think the Canadian Parks Service should place a greater emphasis on facilities and services for winter activities in the park?
Do you have any comments about the current winter opportunities in the park?

Fifty-eight respondents commented on winter activities:

- 25 thought the current situation is adequate
- 18 thought there could be more opportunities
- 6 were opposed to any motorized vehicles
- 7 suggested increasing services
- 3 commented that weather in Waterton discourages winter use

Selected Quotes:

Just don't have powered vehicles. I'd like to mention that airports should never be allowed in parks. I did not find where they were even mentioned - thank goodness. While we were there though an old plane landed on the Lake - I wonder about this?

As one who ice climbs and skis in the park, I think the current level of winter facilities, etc. is adequate.

Need for increased Parks Service visitor services during the winter months including naturalist guided trips, overnight, and day trips.

I'm for non-motorized winter recreation in the park. There are very few "fairly natural looking" settings where there is relative quiet. Let's keep these areas that way for people (and wildlife) who like it that way.

Suitable snow conditions for cross-country skiing occur in such a small area of the park that it is impractical to consider cutting more trails. Tracksetting should certainly not be extended to other trails. I have skied extensively in Waterton's backcountry, and do not care whether park businesses operate in the winter.

Shoulder season and winter season should be encouraged provided they are compatible with park resources ; there is a lot of opportunity (interpretation and tourism) which is being missed. Avalanche hazard needs to be determined.

The current level of service for winter activities is adequate. The development of appropriate recreational pursuits will always be tempered by "Waterton Weather".

Greater emphasis is not necessary! Please, no helicopters overhead as winter is a critical time for wildlife.

The present level of services for winter recreation is sufficient. Equipment rentals, repairs, and skill training should not be given any encouragement; the Waterton winter traveller should be self-sufficient and understand the value of prior conditioning and experience (including familiarity with their own equipment).

Snowshoe cross country trail is a great trail. There should be more emphasis on this trail. Additional cross country trails are needed in the Cameron area (heavy use!). Present winter facilities in Waterton are adequate. It's not economically feasible for other businesses to open, even if winter attendance quadrupled. Leave it as is!

Do not place any more emphasis on services for winter activities in Waterton. The present system of cross-country ski trails is great and there are endless opportunities for snowshoeing and ski-exploring. I don't see any need for track setting and trail grooming. I have skied every Waterton ski trail time and again when I broke trail right from the trailhead and I loved the feeling of being first out on the trail. Don't take that pleasure away from us.

2.2.7 Bicycling (pp. 199 - 208)

Sixty-seven respondents commented on bicycling.

Is there a need for more/better opportunities for casual bicycling in the park?

Eleven respondents commented on casual bicycling:

- 2 thought that current opportunities were adequate others were supportive of increasing opportunities
- others suggested improvements such as developing and widening bike paths

What facilities and services should be provided in the park for touring bicyclists?

Twenty-six respondents commented on touring bicyclists:

- 6 respondents were opposed to providing additional facilities or services, while all other respondents were supportive of providing for the needs of cyclists
- 4 respondents recommended a reservation system for bicyclists
- 5 supported more campsites or special sites for cyclists
- 3 suggested a hostel
- 5 respondents recommended appropriate road design, such as paved shoulders
- other comments related to reservation systems, bike repair facilities and accommodation alternatives

What trail bicycling opportunities do you feel should be provided in Waterton Lakes National Park?

Fifty-seven respondents commented on trail bicycling:

- 15 opposed all trail bicycling
- 15 supported restrictions and controls on trail biking
- 10 recommended more opportunities
- 6 thought current opportunities are adequate
- 5 supported more signage indicating where trail biking is/not allowed
- 1 supported use of fire roads by trail bikers
- 4 called for strict enforcement of regulations

Selected Quotes:

I do not like mountain bikes but feel they are here to stay, therefore, I would like to see adequate signs at trailheads indicating whether they are permitted on the trail or not. I can then hike elsewhere or hike defensively if I know whether to expect bikes.

Other recent studies show that trail bicycling causes considerably more impact than does hiking. Trail bicycling is banned completely in Glacier National Park, Montana. Waterton should adopt a consistent approach and ban trail cycling from all trails. National parks should be the one refuge from mountain bikers, where a person can peacefully hike a trail without having to constantly look over his shoulder or be prepared to dive off the trail at a moment's notice.

Casual bicycling in the park is a nice recreation many people enjoy with minimal impact. Yes more frontcountry trails possibly along roads. Limited backcountry use.

Allow bicycles on designated front and backcountry trails only. All cyclists should be required to have warning bells and use them. Do not widen Cameron Lake and Red Rock Canyon roads to accommodate cyclists. A hostel in the townsite would be useful.

When paved roads are upgraded, paved shoulders for bicycling should be provided despite the unfavorable economics. Bicycling in developed areas of the park is to be encouraged. Conversely, I oppose backcountry bicycling. I support prohibition of any wheeled vehicles in Zone 2. There is excessive chance for sudden and surprising man/bear encounters at very close distances ... Bicycle tours should not have to camp in car campground and/or pay $9 ($7?). I have heard that bicyclists in USA National Parks have special camps and pay less than $1.

It would appear that the park service should attempt to increase access to cyclists, because of the low impact nature of the activity and encourage the use of bicycles as a mode of access to the more remote areas of the park (if this is desirable with respect to ecological concerns).

Reclaim fireroads that bikes are now using. Impose stricter enforcement of trail use by bikes, and the implementation of heavy penalties if caught. Increase public awareness of the impact of bikes on the park and the reasons for the restrictions through pamphlets and/or signage.

Casual bicycling within the townsite and campground should be encouraged and suitable trails developed. Trail bicycling has no place in the backcountry trails.

Education of the rules of the road is a requirement for users. The installation of the campsite reservation system will aid the road/trail weary user if he has made reservations. Given declining budgets mentioned previously, I doubt that additional facilities and services should be made available. I think additional specific mountain bike trails should be made available, or if this is not feasible then dual purpose use trails will have to be provided. Currently, the number of trails is inadequate.

It is definitely increasing in popularity and lack of cheap accommodation for cyclists (touring) could definitely be a problem. Perhaps cyclists should be able to check availability of campsites at park gate and book ahead? Personally I would prefer to see it banned altogether but restriction to two-third trails and adequate signage and enforcement everywhere is probably the best course of action.

2.2.8 Golfing (pp. 209 - 214)

What improvements, if any, would you like to see at the Waterton Golf Course?

Sixty-two respondents commented on golfing:

- 20 were opposed to a golf course in a National Park, or stated the golf course should be removed
- 24 wanted no expansion
- 4 supported improvements but no expansion
- 8 opposed accommodation at the golf course
- 9 commented on poor service and maintenance
- 3 supported improvements, expansion
- 2 supported accommodation at the golf course

Selected Quotes:

In the 1970s the golf course was a joy to play. The golf course in 1989 was a disgrace to all Canadians. The golf course does not need to be expanded. What is required is that Parks Canada take back the management and maintenance of the course.

If we are going to have golf courses in our national parks they should be operated in a first class manner, but not so expensive or overbooked that the average Albertan visitor can't use it. Improvements are acceptable, but no expansion in size. Expansion of the clubhouse may be necessary (or redesigning it). No accommodation on course acceptable.

Try asking the golfers if their home courses could be turned over, to the Nature Conservancy say, for management as wildlife sanctuaries. Then ask them why they think this wildlife sanctuary should be used as a golf course.

Nowhere in the "Background Information" have so many questions been brought up about a certain subject as in the Resource Analysis on golfing but your boldfaced print questions only ask "What improvements, if any would you like to see at the Waterton golf course?" You answered this question for me - None!

Other than for maintenance improvements, the golf course should not see major upgrading or expansion, and certainly not to become the major commercial accommodation outside the townsite. In short, keep it as much as possible as is.

Grrr! Get rid of it. Not compatible with the aims of a National Park.

The present facility should be maintained with no expansion; nor should any new facility be considered. ... Golfing is a very fast-growing sport and the park must be prepared to defend its habitats from inevitable pressure to add facilities.

The golf course should be decommissioned when the existing operating contract expires. At that time (December 1993) natural succession and invasion of the course should be allowed to proceed and all manmade facilities should be removed.

Strict prohibitions on the use of poisons and herbicides should be systematically enforced.

The presence of golf courses in natural parks is highly unsatisfactory, for the following

reasons: golf does not require a national park setting; creation of fairways and greens destroys the natural environment; golf is not a family sport and does not encourage appreciation of the natural environment; pesticides and fertilizers used for maintenance leach into waterways, the water table, and make their way into the park environment; presence of a golf course necessitates animal "control". However, the golf course is already there, so the following are strongly recommended: immediately discontinue the use of pesticides and chemical fertilizer on golf course fairways and greens. The use of organic-derived fertilizer is acceptable, because leaching of nutrients is much less severe. Where rodent control is required, it should be done by trapping, not by poisoning. The method used has not been specified in the management plan review. Poisons should not be used because other animals may feed on the carcasses before disposal or residues may remain for other reasons.

No improvement. Parks are for people wishing to enjoy wilderness conditions. Let golfers go elsewhere.

Since privatization of the golf course, the quality of the course and of service has deteriorated badly. The parks "ongoing" monitoring is a farce as it has been worse each year. The drop in use can further be explained because there is always a tournament on weekends. If a golfer goes elsewhere for the weekend he goes elsewhere for the week. My sister and husband come from B.C. just to golf in Waterton, but this year is the last after being sworn at by an attendant and having T-time bumped by one and a half hours. Course condition is mercurial - up and down, not consistent.

Present operator of golf course is causing more harm than good to Waterton's "image". Given proper management and incentives, this course could be a major attraction not an eyesore!!

I don't like a golf course in Waterton under any circumstances. If it is kept, then there should definitely be no expansion. The Waterton golf course interferes with black bear and grizzly movements, elk and deer winter range, and is off limits to casual hikers. Some aspects of golf course management must surely be legally suspect. There is poisoning and/or shooting of ground squirrels and pocket gophers. These are part of Waterton's wildlife and as such are entitled to full protection. The water diversions in Pass Creek for irrigating the golf course are an infringement on the free flowing streams in a National Park. Fencing is unsightly and the planting of exotic grasses undesirable.

2.2.9 Heritage Appreciation and Interpretation (pp. 215 - 232)

Two questions were asked regarding Heritage Appreciation and Interpretation:

What type of interpretation and heritage appreciation opportunities do you seek?
Do you feel sufficient information is available about the topics you are interested in?

Forty-nine respondents commented on heritage appreciation and interpretation. Responses were generally favorable. Some commended the service provided and many made suggestions for additions and changes. Some of these suggestions included:

- increase and place more emphasis on interpretation of the Park's natural resources and environment
- increase non-personal interpretation
- provide year round interpretive services
- develop cultural interpretive programs

Selected Quotes:

Keep up the good work. An idea may be to integrate near past history events along with present trends, eg. maps and material on the local services available.

We, our children and now our grandchildren have enjoyed your interpretive services and personal contact with park naturalists. But I wish you would not refer to wildlife etc. as our Natural Heritage. Please teach people that all wild living things exist in their own right. They are not ours!

The Biosphere Reserve should be worked into one of the themes and given high priority. Information about the Man and the Bioshere program should be provided at the visitor center and during talks by Park staff.

Beef up interpretation of nationally/internationally significant features eg. Mokowan Butte, Foothills Parkland, riparian along Wataban River.

There is a great need for a park museum to interpret heritage, natural history, park conservation and preservation, park management, etc. I would give this a very high priority ahead of any other capital expense, except possibly moving the park maintenance operation. In my view, park interpretation is much too shallow. I know many visitors can't be bothered by detail, but the depth must be there somewhere!

Thirty or sixty second verbal 'commercials' should be included in the interpretive programs to increase public awareness about wildlife feeding, habituation, and other topics .

Make the tourist information centre a 'bigger draw' to attract more people. This site could then be used to increase public awareness. The centre may have to be moved to a larger site, such as the heritage centre. Use the centre for an aggressive public education campaign.
Develop a program to encourage hikers to pick up any litter by supplying small bags. Could be used in the 30 second 'commercials' also.

I find it interesting that your three park themes that rate high priority are focussed on "humans" and their effect, with the exception perhaps of that of Management of Park Resources. There seems to be a lack of themes designed to focus on the ecology of the national parks, the animals, and their requirements, the negative impact that humans can have on the animals, erosion problems, etc. All of these high priority (my version) themes seem to have medium to low priority. I don't think "oil strike" has high priority... People, I think and hope, have become environmentally conscious. Take advantage, teach them about the purpose behind the parks the need of the animals and flora and how they can help aid in this and how they interfere and aggravate it by some of what they do!

Non personnel services should be improved (in handouts at gate, roadside interpretation displays, campground displays) - more on site exhibits.

Provide more signs and pullout shoulders. Programs are very good.

The heritage centre should post hours outside and have staff there at that time.

"When the Prairie goes up" is a poor Park theme.

There is both demand, I feel, and need for a winter interpretative program. The park would far better achieve its wilderness and passive recreation objectives if a year-round interpretative and events calendar were undertaken. At present the park resource is grossly underutilized.

Waterton's interpretive program seems to be considerably less ambitious than that of other mountain parks.

Have anthropological and cultural museums, and display history and culture of the area, not just the park. Perhaps an in-depth library on the parks inhabitants (flora/fauna) and geological, ecological and environmental features should be considered.

Develop a program on native use of the park with a native interpreter.

2.2.10 Trip Planning and Park Information (pp. 233 - 244)

Forty-six respondents commented on trip planning and park information:

Do you have any comments on visitor information outlets in Waterton Lakes National Park?

Twenty-one respondents commented on visitor information outlets:

- 9 thought the information centres are adequate as they are - that they are useful, and staff helpful
- 7 respondents discussed consolidating or relocating the information centres (including nearer the gate, or a new centre in town)
- 3 suggested providing more information outside the park - in information centres in southern Alberta, across the border in the U.S., and at larger centres and other National Parks
- 1 respondent thought staff needed more training

Do you have any comments on reception and orientation to Waterton Lakes National Park?

- 3 commented on reception and orientation
- 1 asked why a "welcome" was needed
- 2 suggested improvements, including a bulletin board at the gate, or an information brochure, and information on conditions within the park, such as full campgrounds

Does in-park information meet your needs?

Twenty-five respondents commented on information:

- 10 thought the information available was adequate and met their needs.
- all other comments involved suggestions for improving the information available in the park

These suggestions included:

- a detailed guide should be given out at the gate
- focus on staff answering questions, not on more brochures
- special phone-in line
- information on timetables, programs
- including the whereabouts of park information with the park permit
- sell or rent a self-guiding audio tapes
- provide more information on backcountry use, camping and fishing permits
- provide a "minimum impact" pamphlet
- betters guides for car sightseeing
- provide a self serve pamphlet rack with the information on the businesses in the park
- redesign "You are in Bear Country" to catch the attention of frequent visitors

Do you have any additional comments on trip planning and park information?

Six respondents made additional comments:

- 3 were concerned with "advertising" the park
- 1 suggested reciprocal or extended day passes for U.S. visitors and signs in the U.S. about the park
- 1 commended the Park's display at the Calgary Stampede and suggested other exhibits
- 1 responded that park information is well done

Selected Quotes:

I think park information is quite complete. The information centre is useful and the wardens, etc. have been very helpful through the mail, by phone, and in person.

Staff at the Park Information Centre should have better knowledge and experience in the Park, particularly its scenic drives and trails. Greater emphasis on this should be given when hiring.

A Park Naturalist should be available or on call at the Information Centre to answer questions about Park features.

Many more written materials for trip planning and about trails are needed.

I would like to commend the park personnel that I have met at the information centre and at the warden's office on their helpfulness in answering my question on park history and prehistory. Please devise a new "You are in Bear Country" pamphlet. Because I use the national parks quite a bit each year I receive quite a few of these pamphlets. Since they look the same year after year, I just throw them out. If they looked different I would probably be enticed into reading them.

Detailed park information should be provided at various roadside tourist information centers in the area south from Calgary, especially Pincher Creek, Fort McLeod, Lethbridge, Cardston. A publication outlining all park attractions should be available at the park entrance and all other major points in the park eg. all campgrounds.

Often information on appropriate backcountry "behaviour" is lacking,I find this particularly true due to the various regulations between different national parks, and the frequent policy changes. This is not to say all national parks should be standardized, rather, that current specific policies for Waterton Lakes National Parks be freely available in printed form.

A brochure entitled "Park Etiquette - Environmentally Friendly Practices For Visitors" should be produced and given to all visitors entering the park. It should include: information about flower picking or collecting; about animal feeding; littering problems; suggestions

to use foot, bicycle and public transportation instead of a car wherever possible; and the consequences of trail shortcutting. Reasons for these suggestions should be included.

Absolutely cease and desist forever in advertising Waterton Park as if it were some privately owned commodity to be sold to the top bidder. If no one visits the park at all then nothing is lost of the park's real values. This constant advertising can ruin the very character of Waterton if too many people use it. I resent very much that a part of Waterton's budget would go for the kinds of advertising that serve to benefit private business in Waterton.

I believe the old Registration Office should be used as the first available source of information to people entering the park, before they reach the new Registration Office location.

Yes, better orientation upon entering the park is needed. A pull-off with a big bulletin board would be nice, or even an information brochure routinely handed out with the park permit with more detail than existing. Park information meets my needs as I am somewhat familiar with the area and self-sufficient, but out of province people need much more information. However, they are likely to obtain much by stopping at the Information Centre and asking questions - a huge selection of brochures may be unnecessary and just produce more garbage.

I would say that information on the conditions and availability (whether they are full or not) of campgrounds, picnic sites, water recreation sites be made available to incoming traffic . Terribly annoying and frustrating to drive a long way and then find "full" signs all over.

2.2.11 Opportunities for the Disabled (pp. 245 - 250)

What facilities do you feel should receive a priority for accessibility by disabled persons?

Forty-one respondents commented on this question:

- 6 thought that the current policy is good
- 2 commented that it is difficult to provide total access in this setting
- 1 respondent was concerned with the cost of providing access for a very limited number of disabled visitors

Selected Quotes:

I think townsite facilities (i.e. sidewalks etc.) should be provided for the disabled. I do not think it is feasible to expect much more.

Vehicle tours remain best solution for disabled.

Provide some tapes for the sightless as they have in Banff-Lake Louise.

I'm all for creating more opportunities for the disabled. However, only the disabled should benefit from this. For example, people who would run a gondola operation "so that the disabled can enjoy the view too" should only be allowed to let the disabled ride it and for free, to show that they are truly humanitarian in their purpose.

Guidelines for accessibility should be drawn up in consultation with local and other handicapped associations.

There should be some trail development which is accessible to the disabled. This would also enable older citizens the opportunity for walking. Basic services should be accessible i.e. washrooms. If priority in Waterton is a hiking experience handicapped should have opportunity to participate as well.

I support upgrading the Townsite trail to make it more wheelchair accessible. However, I oppose wholesale remodelling of older facilities, because this would be too costly. I also oppose carving or blasting ramps into natural features like rock faces. Some motels and frontcountry camping facilities and washrooms should be made wheelchair-accessible.

Considerable opportunity currently exists for the moderately disabled with shorter horseback trips, boating and some types of cycling.

The visitor information centre should be a priority for wheelchair confined visitors.

Hopefully a new visitor centre will be established some day at the entrance and, in addition to making it fully accessible to people in wheelchairs, there should be some thought given to positioning the displays at appropriate heights, perhaps including some touch-displays to orient the seeing-impaired who also appreciate special audio-based interpretive material.

All buildings, walkways, and information stations should be made accessible to disabled persons. No new roads or trails should be constructed.

Waterton Lakes National Park is being rebuilt for only the strong and the young. If nothing else - please quit moving all parking far away from the action areas.

Although some areas are inaccessible it should be borne in mind that few disabled people travel alone and this restricted access may not be a problem, although it is no reason they should be denied the facilities should funds be available to improve them. However, before full upgrading of facilities is considered, the potential number of users should be established.

A bus service drop off to Cameron Lake and Red Rock Canyon could be useful to hikers, strollers, the aged and the disabled.

Facilities that should receive a priority are those needed to use and understand the parks i.e. washrooms, warden's office, visitors center, etc. To me the pool would be nice but I question why it is in a National Park anyway - so I am a little ambivalent. I do think some trails need to be accessible and I would favour concentrating on the heavily used day treks . Disabled can also mean the elderly who have a hard time with elevation and would appreciate benches, mild platform approach as a wheelchair would need, etc. What does disable-friendly mean? Do we need to essentially put in a paved road and significant facilities to make them disable friendly? ... I personally would not like to see these extend into the backcountry.

2.3 Waterton Townsite (pp. 253 - 254)

Sixty-three respondents commented on Waterton townsite.

What do you think the role of the townsite should be within Waterton Lakes National Park?

Twenty-three respondents commented on the role of the townsite within the park:

- 3 liked the role as is
- 8 thought the town should be a service centre only - essential services
- 3 thought the town should provide facilities for tourists
- 1 thought the town should be the primary commercial centre in the park
- 1 thought the town should be the nucleus of entire park
- 1 suggested the town be moved outside the park
- 1 suggested the town become a role model for low environmental impact lifestyle

Has the townsite reached its upper limit in terms of size and density? If not, in what sectors (ie. commercial accommodation, commercial sales and service, residential, recreational, open space, parking, institutional, roads) is expansion desirable?

Fifty-one respondents commented on the size of the town:

- 33 thought no expansion should be allowed, that the town has reached its upper limit
- 2 supported minimal expansion
- 3 thought commercial accommodation should be expanded
- 5 thought increased density would be acceptable (although not increased size)
- 4 respondents thought any further development should be done outside the park

Suggestions for further development include:

- gas station open year around seven days a week
- more parking in summer
- no more commercial development beyond Bed & Breakfast
- hostel in town- open space

- residential expansion, and restricted commercial expansion
- upgrade Prince of Wales Hotel
- new, large modern lodge, open year round
- close off main street to vehicle traffic

Are you satisfied with the current character of the townsite? If not, what changes would you like to see?

Twenty-three respondents commented on the character of the townsite:

- 8 said it is good, lovely as is
- 7 thought there was a need for an architectural theme, guidelines/controls
- 4 begged that it not be turned into another Banff
- 2 suggested extending the new main street theme
- 1 suggested a low profile, to fit the environment
- 1 wanted to maintain the European-Mountain type character

Should more of an effort be made to keep townsite facilities and services open during the shoulder and winter seasons?

Twenty-five respondents commented on keeping facilities open during the shoulder and winter seasons:

- 14 supported this
- 3 thought it would be nice but was not feasible
- 9 were opposed

Selected Quotes:

A gas station open year round, seven days a week is needed. Current stations are often closed when expected to be open. Only a small variety of food and shelter services are required. We don't need another Banff with all the stores that should be in the city. There is a need (small) for some hardware/ boating/ sporting good supplies but no new developments.

I think any town in a national park should be limited to a service centre. I think Waterton has reached its limit in size and density. I like the town as it is, but an effort could be made to make an architectural theme. It would be nice to have more things open in the off season, but demand is probably not there.

Townsite role should continue to be to provide support services for visitors to the park primarily, and residents secondarily. The townsite should not be developed as an entity and attraction in itself, although the moulding of an architectural motif should be contin-

ued. The Waterton Avenue redevelopment of sidewalks and roads should have been extended to the whole business section of town.

The area of the townsite should not be expanded. No increase in commercial facilities should be permitted outside the present townsite boundaries. No further expansion of cottage development should be allowed.

The role of the townsite should be the support of the park not the growth of the town. I realize the distinction is fuzzy and that this goes against the basic premise of business (growth) but this should be viewed as part of the cost of living and doing business in a national park.

We would suggest keeping further development of the townsite to the minimum possible. Open space and possibly parking are the only areas where more development may be necessary. The emphasis should remain on the natural attractions of the park and the townsite should be used only to assist in further enjoyment of the natural park areas.

I think there should be expansion in the area of commercial accommodation if businesses in the park are to remain viable or to improve their facilities. I feel that the Emerald Bay Motel should not be removed until new accommodations are prepared to be built.

No new expansion in town. One of the beauties of the park (compared to Banff) is that it has less congestion and traffic.

Youth hostel should be encouraged because there is no simple, cheap accommodation available.

No effort should be made to expand the season as this acts as a buffer that allows the park to rest.

The only permissible additions might be pockets of five or ten tenting spaces in the townsite campground and the extension of some businesses and services (including a loop or two of the townsite campground) into the shoulder season past Thanksgiving.

Without sacrificing buildings of obvious heritage interest (unless they're simply ugly), an architectural theme should be pursued with some requirements for upgrading or modifying building facades. Merchants should be expected to face some costs in terms of creating a varied but integrated ambience. Sign standards in terms of materials and sizing should be strictly established. The architectural plan for the community should especially control any alterations or new construction, and it should avoid imposing some artificial character that has no link with the history of the town. Materials and colour schemes should stress earth values and subtle hues, nothing plastic or gaudy.

The townsite and park should adopt "environmentally friendly" policies, which promote

activities that do not harm the environment. This is especially true in the townsite, where the following practices could be adopted: mandatory recycling in residences and business; promote the three Rs: reduce ,reuse, and recycle; restriction of over-packaged products; state of the art sewage treatment plant; prohibiting synthetic pesticides; promote the use of bicycles and foot traffic in the townsite and restrict motor vehicle traffic; discourage the use of inefficient vehicles such as motorhomes and motorboats, which are classic examples of excessive consumption. The townsite could gradually become an example of a low environmental impact lifestyle, which visitors could learn about during visits. This approach can be justified in a national park, because current lifestyle are altering the global environment sufficiently to pose a long term threat to the Waterton biosphere.

Without losing its tranquil character, there would be some room to increase the density in the townsite. More accommodation (not necessarily hotels/motels) are needed. Area-wise however, I think it has reached very close to its limits. Definitely there should be a few more services open in shoulder and winter seasons.

Since it probably shouldn't have been built at this location in the first place it should definitely not expand.

There are lots of zoned commercial areas in the town that remain to be developed. Redo the curbs and gutters. New lighting. Bury Trans-Alta cables. Ball diamond open space, revert to campground. Yes, there should be more shoulder season services open. Have to compete with Florida.

2.4 Support Facilities (pp. 259 - 263)

Do you have any comments on support facilities in Waterton Lakes National Park?

Forty respondents commented on support facilities. A great variety of suggestions were made; the most common theme was the need for addressing environmental concerns.

Selected Quotes:

Retain all cabins as heritage resources.

Fire tower and Cameron cabin could be used as Interpretation facilities.

Warden service/Interpretation require a larger facility for office space . Consider the swimming pool facility.

Main issues again are garbage and sewage disposal. It is the same anywhere now. But one must not stint on supplying best facilities for these things.

I think the unused wardens cabins should be removed and the areas rehabilitated.

Move bulk storage and maintenance outside the park if possible.

I am against all removal of any structure unless an improvement is substituted and in some cases developed to its highest and best use.

Move the ones that are harming wildlife and ones that are in danger of flooding.

Backcountry cabins should be kept open if at all possible because they may be utilized in emergency times both for public or wardens. If you don't have them you may be sorry one day. Yes keep cabins up and supplied with the cost considered second. Only a backcountry person truly understands this logic, unfortunately.

Maintenance Compound should be relocated if a more suitable site can be found, and the present site reclaimed. Does the park have a containment plan in place for spill of fuel and hazardous chemicals? Is the sewage lagoon lined? Is there regular monitoring of surface and groundwater quality downstream of the lagoon? Could backcountry patrol cabins which are no longer required be used to accommodate backcountry campers? It would seem to be easier on the environment.

Boundary Bay Cabin should be demolished. A new cabin is necessary at Lone Lake. Fall Boundary Cabins very necessary.

Consideration of aesthetic impact of support facilities should be more important whenever such facilities are being moved or upgraded. It would not be cost effective to make major changes to support facilities until changes are necessary for other reasons as well (in addition to aesthetics).

I feel any structures that are not used should be removed from the park. I support the closure and rehabilitation of the firetower access road. I hope the reconstruction of the Lone Lake cabin occurs farther from the Lake, as it occupies one of the best of the already scarce areas to camp around the lake. It would also be nice if it was built of log or other material that blends with the surroundings. The cabin at Snowshoe looks very unharmonious with its environment.

The bulk storage area on Blakiston Fan is a real problem aesthetically. There must be a way to make it less visible and still keep the impact down.

Support facilities should be kept at or near the state of the art in order to minimize environmental impact. Monitoring of any area that may be considered hazardous must be instituted as a part of the management plan. I say this because of the horror stories I have seen as an environmental consultant to industry.

Our members have a hankering for old warden structures, at least those that go back 30 plus years. They usually tell a story, often times the major one being how our parks have changed over the years. This soft spot aside, however, unused buildings nowadays attract a lot of vandals and other unappreciative users, with that in mind: keep buildings of historical interest; upgrade, using log construction, where necessary; reclaim the firetower road; and remove buildings that do not fit into the above.

The ultimate fate of park and townsite garbage is not stated in the management plan review. This should be rectified. Special concerns arise if a landfill site is used. Is the site lined with an impermeable barrier to prevent leaching into groundwater? What precautions are made to ensure hazardous waste does not enter the landfill? (paints, pesticide residues, used engine oil, spray cans, batteries, etc.) The management plan does not state the level of treatment obtained by the sewage lagoon. What levels of effluent are discharged, and is it fully capable of handling peak loads? Is effluent monitoring carried out on a routine basis?

Maintain warden stations and backcountry cabins as they are. Expand warden and interpretation offices for staff and public use.

The bulk storage area should be surveyed and lots leased out for storage and maintenance purposes to townsite operators only. This would free existing land in the townsite for more appropriate development. A staff housing complex could be developed along the hillsides next to the compound. Again, this would free up land in the townsite. The Maintenance Compound should stay where it is. There is no other place for it.

I believe a return to the old system of wardens living in backcountry cabins would be good. However, due to restraints it is unlikely. Maybe some future government will see the need for more public service employment but this is most unlikely for the next decade.

Remove all backcountry cabins and fire towers etc. We tent, so can the wardens.

Maintenance compound - you have to have one!! The warden and staff of the park must know where there is a good location. Also I would recommend a fence and a texas gate to keep wildlife from poisoning themselves. Maintain only those Warden cabins needed to do the patrolling necessary.

2.5 Regional Integration (pp. 269 - 277)

Fifty-six respondents commented on regional integration.

Do you have any concerns about the regional coordination of natural and cultural resource management, or any ideas for improving this coordination?

Forty-four respondents discussed concerns about the regional coordination of natural and cultural resource management, focusing on protecting the park:

- 7 respondents supported the Peace Park, Crown of the Continent and Biosphere programs
- 14 respondents advocated expanding the borders of the park
- 17 expressed a need for more regional cooperation to protect the park
- 4 discussed, in general, the need for regional cooperation
- 1 asked that the park not return to a "fortress" mentality, but work with local ranchers
- 1 respondent was not concerned with additional protection for the park

What role do you think Waterton Lakes National Park should play in providing regional tourism opportunities?

Do you have any additional regional integration concerns that you feel should be addressed in the park management plan?

Fifteen respondents discussed the role of the park:

- 2 thought Waterton should be the focus of regional tourism opportunities
- 2 others thought the park should not play any role in promoting regional tourism opportunities
- Other respondents made a variety of suggestions regarding the role of the park, included under Selected Quotes

Selected Quotes:

> *The park service should more actively promote the unique aspects of the Greater Waterton - Glacier/Crown of the Continent Ecosystem. As well the park service should promote the interpretive and passive recreational aspects. It should also promote and interpret the park's place within its surrounding resource management and tourism region. The Park should provide year round passive tourism opportunities - no downhill skiing, for example. The park should promote itself as a year round destination, unique in its ecology/management as well as its passive tourism approach. This, I think, would appeal very much to the tourist/visitor of the 1990s. I believe that the park service should encourage certain types of interpretive/resort development on its periphery so long as such developments complement rather than detract from the ecological,interpretive, and tourism goals of the park.*

No park fees - rather a user fee for services. Participate in joint projects and partnerships on a business basis. More people control on designated fenced trails and hunting control within a radius of 100 miles of a National Park.

The Canadian Parks Service usually seems to take a rather wimpy approach to regional management issues. This "cooperative" approach has resulted in legions of hunters lining up along the park boundary, oil and gas extraction activities on (and indeed under) the park's boundary, logging to within hundreds of metres of the park boundary, roads built right to the park boundaries, abuses of the park by some adjacent ranchers, proposals for waterslide parks just outside the park, etc. etc. Surely with the weight of the Federal Government behind it the Canadian Parks Service could address this sort of problem more constructively than it has in the past. While regional conservation issues are largely ignored, the park nonetheless finds the resources to help the local chambers of commerce promote the park as a tourist destination. It's time that "conservation" became more than just an empty word in a park policy manual.

There is a tendency to want to promote all national parks as the major attraction of their region, to load all the infrastructure and costs into the federal jurisdiction then complain when the park imposes costs. Canadian Parks Service and Waterton Lakes must insure that its promotion as part of the region is appropriate to its purpose and within its capacity. Regional integration must recognize that the park also needs support, and in this case, quite possible additional lands. The emphasis must be on mutual benefits. Consider the long term economic impacts if instead of Waterton Lakes National Park there was only a forestry license and perhaps a few wells. There have been benefits well worth the cost, and the park shouldn't be afraid to assert that it contributes its share.

Increased cooperation between outside authorities and the park authorities is essential (this is easier said than done). Especially in areas of wildlife management, close cooperation and a collective goal must be established. Consideration should be given to adding important land areas to the park to provide more complete ecosystem protection. Note: some hunting of elk and deer outside the park may help avoid overpopulations within the park as happens at Elk Island.

The park should move towards acquiring adjacent lands as they come up for sale, especially land immediately adjoining. Waterton Park with its rich cultural heritage and amazing diverse wildlife and scenery is a treasure, and will become more and more important as a regional tourist opportunity as long as it preserves those resources.

I endorse the idea of giving regional integration a higher profile in the revised Park Management Plan. An ecological buffer zone should be established to include: municipalities; Crown lands such as oil, gas and mineral leases and grazing leases; and neighboring jurisdictions. A management committee administering this buffer zone should have the power, if not to stop development in immediately adjacent areas, at least to require nearby munici-

palities and governmental agencies overseeing border areas to consult with Waterton Lakes National Park about possible impacts of proposed developments before development permits are issued. Gas well development in the immediate surrounding area should be studied very carefully and, if possible, curtailed. There have been problems of herbicides, used to keep roadsides and areas around power lines clear of weeds, drifting into the park. Weeds from cleared areas have invaded the park. These, and like, problems have to be watched carefully. To the greatest extent possible, campgrounds on the park's periphery should be administered at least by the provincial parks ministry and not be privatized.

We are thoroughly disenchanted with the Canadian Parks Service for participating in development oriented promotional schemes such as the Waterton tourism marketing strategy and the trail of the Great Bear Scam. It would be interesting to hear an explanation of how the statement on page 273 ("Waterton Lakes National Park cannot meet all the use and development pressures placed upon it without damaging its integrity as a national park") can be reconciled with marketing strategies and promotional schemes that will bring more people to Waterton and the Waterton area. We strongly object to the Parks Service participating in schemes whose objectives are diametrically opposed to the direction in which our national parks must move over the next ten years if Canadians are to retain significant parts of their natural heritage!

The Crown of the Continent Ecosystem and the Waterton Biosphere Reserve are magnificent concepts. I am glad that the Canadian Parks Service personnel are working with the Northern Continental Divide Grizzly Bear Management Committee. I suppose it is too much to try to put the Poll Haven area back into the park and build some hotels, motels and campgrounds at Mountain View.

It would be nice to see the Flathead Provincial Forest area in B.C. become part of Waterton National Park. It would help to protect this area and would also add to the status of Waterton - Glacier being an international peace park. Areas that were once part of Waterton Park, such as the South Castle River area, should once again be made part of the park to provide protection for as large an area as possible.

To capitalize on tourism more fully, development of a regional coordinator would appear necessary. But we would also gain new problems with the benefits, and if you are trying to gain 'some' control over visitors is more and more visitors the answer? An area lets the oil and gas industry develop - if Parks Canada says no - what right does the area have to direct the park? Life is a two way street.

Peace Park Concept should be of prime importance! Closer marketing initiatives with Chinook Country Tourist Association and the University of Calgary. Support the trail of the Great Bear initiatives and concept, especially when the marketing process starts.

I feel Waterton Park should be included in a regional tourism plan but should certainly not

jeopardize its mandate, to preserve and protect ecosystems, in order to accommodate large tourist numbers. Modern tourists are coming to the realization (whether they like it or not) that the natural areas protected in national parks can only stand so much "people invasions". Quotas will become a necessity and will have to be tolerated by tourists if they wish to experience "wilderness".

Waterton Parks is for us the main reason for travel to southern Alberta. Don't underestimate the drawing power that attracts tourists to Waterton. Maintaining a "natural" national park is the only role Waterton should play in a regional tourism plan.

2.6 Limits to Development

The questions asked in the background document were:

Examining the limits to development of the park is a fundamental issue for the planning program. With regards to an upper limit for development, do you think that Waterton Lakes National Park:

- **is not near an upper limit for development?**
- **is approaching an upper limit for development?**
- **has reached an upper limit for development?**
- **has exceeded an upper limit for development?**

We would also appreciate an indication of the reasons for your opinion.

Fifty-eight respondents commented on limits to development:

- 7 said not near an upper limit for development
- 14 said approaching an upper limit
- 21 said has reached an upper limit
- 3 said has reached or exceeded an upper limit
- 9 said has exceeded an upper limit for development

Selected Quotes:

Not near an upper limit for development: I would not recommend development outside the existing townsite. I do, however, feel that accommodation within the townsite could be of much higher density, condominium type, and so on. I also feel that such units should be available for private ownership and that the townsite should function on a year round basis, its focus being more intense interpretation and passive recreation.

Approaching an upper limit for development: In some areas the upper limit has been passed eg. backcountry picnic shelters. In general national parks should be kept in as

natural a state as possible. Development should be used only where necessary to avoid damage to the environment.

Quickly approaching an upper limit for development: I think this is so because there are roads to all the major valleys, trails up all smaller valleys, campsites, and the townsite has reached its limit. Also the golf course and support facilities have reached their limit.

Approaching an upper limit for development: The area that needs to be developed to a greater degree is accommodations and camping. The percentage of people using or impacting the park is quite small. If there were more accommodation it would have a large impact on the townsite and small impact on the park outside the townsite. This would allow a small amount of additional tourists in the townsite and help the businesses to a much larger extent.

Approaching an upper limit for development: Due to its small size, and its even more limited 'easily accessible' area, Waterton cannot realistically handle massive additional development without adversely affecting visitor experience. There is, however, enough margin for modest expansion.

Has reached an upper limit for development. This is a small park that is reverting to a wilderness concept. With its wildlife populations development must be held to no more than the present level and preservation must be emphasized more than use (i.e. small strolling trails etc.).

Has reached an upper limit for development: Basically, the services and facilities we need are there, they just need to be refined. Most important, the park is very near carrying capacity in many respects

Has reached an upper limit for development: Having visited the park for over ten years, each year is busier, more hikers, jams at entrance and information bureau etc. It is very small and fragile ecologically, compared to other national parks.

Has reached an upper limit for development: Basically there is no more room for it to grow. Also, continued development increases water pollution, garbage disposal problems, noise pollution, etc. Wilderness is what is desired. One does not need another city setting in the middle of the mountains. It is the city that one escapes from. Increased development would remove this escape.

Has reached an upper limit for development: The park is not used effectively through the seasons. Lots of attractions exist in shoulder seasons - flower blooms/fall colours/wildlife yet there is a relatively low use and little marketing of such.

Has reached its limit: Banff townsite is a mockery of national park purposes and an example of the effect of political control over the Canadian Parks Service. It is an "anti-

model" to be steered far clear of by any means!

Waterton is at the upper limit for development except for the townsite which has exceeded it. Standards for development need to be strengthened. Some commercial developments (two motels especially) are ugly and too tall, they do not fit in.

Has reached an upper limit for development or has exceeded. Virtually all of the parks natural heritage resources are showing impact beyond 'trivial'. Impacts appear to be accumulating and accelerating.

Has reached or exceeded development (i.e. golf course is not necessary). As stated previously, we must preserve wilderness areas in national parks (especially in southern Canada) as they will, in 20 yrs, be the only wilderness left.

Waterton Lakes National Park has exceeded an upper limit for development. The services offered at the townsite for example could exist just outside of the park. How does development such as this help you in your primary mandate - conservation?

2.7 Other Comments

Do you have any other comments that do not fit into the above topics?

Fifty-three respondents either made comments here, or made general comments elsewhere in their submission, such as in a covering letter. The comments covered a great variety of topics, similar to those found in the preceding, more specific sections. In addition, respondents praised the park, expressed appreciation for the public involvement process, commented on the overall planning process, and had some suggestions for the park.

Selected Quotes:

Given the volume of people, there needs to be a cash machine! Had to drive 50 miles to find one last summer!

The sport of Kiting is a national enhancement to the pollution free activities available in Waterton. Just as the park is known for its windsurfing so may it become renowned as an end destination resort where one can participate in the sport of kiting. Included is a copy of a letter we wrote to a freelance writer inquiring about the joys of kiting. We hope you will include this sport in Part III Visitors' Activities and Facilities. With regard to our wildlife, when flying we have noted only curiosity from the sheep and deer on the immediate area, never concern or fear. Thank you.

Regarding ... the classic 'use and preserve 'conflict of the Parks Service mandate, clearly, conservation must win in the end. Otherwise you become just another recreational destination. There are several implications here. One is that the new management plan must turn towards emphasizing the natural values that make Waterton Lakes truly deserving of national park and biosphere reserve status. ... The second implication is funding and priorities. ... To some extent the park, which has become service oriented must be retrofitted to become more protection oriented. ... The third implication is in regional development. No one should expect a single park the size of Waterton Lakes to preserve natural heritage, serve as a recreational destination or summer vacation centre for the region, cater to the entertainment demands of hordes of tourists, serve as a destination resort in regional promotion campaigns, and place no stresses on its neighbours. The park provides considerable support to the region, and should demand considerable support in return. ... The detailed look at the issues that the background information provides makes it easy to forget the broader picture of conservation and protection and instead to suggest improvements to the existing infrastructure. I hope that one of the planning options will take resource conservation (rather than the status quo) as its starting premise, and in each category present alternatives which when taken as a whole will move the park towards a higher level of preservation of its inherent values. ... I am suggesting that in this case rather than proposing to increase conservation from the status quo, determine where the conservation path should have led to in the first place and propose movement towards that.

The main thrust of the new plan should be expanded protection for the park and a strong resistance to more development within park boundaries. The reason for this line of thinking is the fact that the park is only of a finite size, with potential encroachments on its continued survival a daily threat. Man on the other hand can find infinite ways to spoil the wilderness areas.

My first impression is that the information it contains is for the most part overstated, exaggerated and biased. The writers would have us believe that the park is doomed to imminent destruction by the intrusion of man. Endangered plants, endangered animals, endangered birds, and overuse are all mentioned as if to have us believe that more judicious park management is necessary to solve this. Well, I don't believe it for a minute. Perhaps they would feel better if a high chain link fence were put around it and all people except themselves were kept out forever. The park is over regulated as it is, and every year I hear people declaring they won't visit the park as often because of the petty restrictions and paranoia displayed by some of the park wardens.

"Background Information Management Plan Review, October, 1989" has to be one of the best descriptions of Waterton Lakes National Park ever compiled. This should be in schools as a text book. I'm keeping my copy.

I am happy to respond to the Waterton Management Plan Review. The Public Response Form was sent to my mother, and we discussed many of the plans questions as a family. My responses represent those of a family whose interests in the park: go back to 1927 with

the building of a cabin in the park; include a small acreage directly adjacent to the park boundary; and own horses... Thank you for the opportunity to participate.

In the entire province of Alberta and indeed the entire Dominion of Canada there is no piece of ground more precious to me than Waterton Lakes National Park. I greatly appreciate all of the positive things that have been done on behalf of preservation of Waterton's wilderness aspect by the Canadian Parks Service. There is yet more to be done and I am willing to help in any way, and my help now is through this reply to the Management Plan.

We are pleased that the revised Park Management Plan addresses the question of protecting park resources versus visitor demands. Maintaining the ecological integrity of national parks is extremely important and must be reflected in park management plans. Regional integration has also received attention in the revised Park Management Plan. We consider this approach to be particularly important for the protection of the wildlife and other natural values of Waterton Lakes.

Parks seem to bend to lease and business licences in parks and the preservation of parks is put to the side. Government (parks) must take a tougher stand on preservation and minimize development.

I do feel that if too many outsiders come - other than Canadians - we should not plan for them first. Remember Canadians pay indirectly for these parks and should be encourage to see Canada first.

It's a glorious park that has a special place in my heart. The upper limits for development have been reached. Though the temptation is to make the park everything for everybody all the time, it's impossible. Somehow and at some point in time the main gate will have to be closed to control the impact - a formidable challenge!

One thing that I am concerned about is the amount of both controlled and uncontrolled pets throughout the parks system. This is true in both the front country and backcountry. Most people do not hike all day with a heavy pack to be barked at by someone's dog when you reach your destination. Can this be approached in the new plan??

My information is that the Waterton Biosphere Reserve Program has lost some momentum. In particular it is not clear how the program is facilitating or interacting with the Management Plan Review. This is an issue which I would like to see reviewed since the Canadian Parks Service holds membership on the Biosphere Reserve Management Committee.

I am disturbed that widening of the entrance highway was undertaken without public involvement. Was the widening really necessary? Certainly not for motor vehicles. What were the alternatives? The project should at least have had lower priority than some other

needs such as relocation of the Maintenance Compound and an Interpretive Museum.

I am getting tired of the word "tourism"! I feel one should enjoy the park as it is, as long as there is management control. I am glad the plan does not point to "commercialism".

Semi-primitive motorized recreation is not provided for those people not able to backpack. Even in USA the semi-primitive motorized recreation is a recognized component in the recreation spectrum; it appears it is not the case with Parks Canada.

The planning and management process should be done from the resource protection viewpoint. After defining what's there, what merits protection and how much, you then know which uses are conflicting and can assess which need to be changed and which can be accepted. I note the above, not because you don't know the process, but in anticipation of your receiving many recommendations to make the environment fit the development.

Of the national parks in Alberta Waterton has a backwater image yet it has more features readily accessible than other major parks. Waterton should focus on its hiking accessibility of features and hopefully avoid the problem of Jasper and Banff where townsites have become more important than the parks.

Thank you for your trust in allowing me to review this document.

I am impressed with the wisdom of the park management in taking this approach to future planning. Inviting public participation and comment is a proactive and powerful means of implementing change. I hope to see a continuation of this type of forum and anticipate an active role in the future.

Park review papers should be printed on paper of high recycled fiber content. As mentioned above, the park should promote "environmentally friendly" practices, because of possible long term adverse affects on the national park by wasteful practices of the general public.

I was fortunate to see the park in its early stages before commercialism. Why do you allow souvenir shops, clothing stores, etc. Wilderness preservation should be paramount.

Warden and interpretation sections are underfunded. More funds will have to become available to obtain park protection, visitor understanding and enjoyment.

The budgetary constraints that are being placed on Waterton's managers is wrong. Other parks have been allowed to upgrade; let Waterton have its turn. Take some of the Western Regional Office (Calgary) person years and let Waterton finally get some decent streets, sidewalks, light standards, etc. The union has far too much say when park managers try to re-allocate man-years and priorities. This has to be changed!!

I am a strong supporter of wildlife preservation and conservation of the environment. I am attracted to the national parks, primarily for hiking which offers beautiful scenery, wildlife and vegetation and a welcome escape from urban life, noise, pollution, stress, etc. I think it is important for the parks to provide good services and facilities but I am wary of too much expansion, overcrowding, etc. The environment should be our major concern, over and above tourism.

I think Waterton provides a setting and range of recreational opportunities very different from Banff and Jasper. Let's keep it that way! Models that work for them should not be applied here.

Emphasis must be placed on keeping Waterton Lakes National Park as natural and undeveloped as possible. Canadian Parks Service should not consider trying to accommodate all future requests or demands made by the public if it means more development.

Do you have any comments or requests concerning this public consultation program?

Thirty-two respondents commented on the public consultation program:

- 19 were appreciative of the opportunity for involvement
- 4 asked to be kept informed
- 3 respondents had concerns about the process (comment period too short, views have been ignored in the past, and survey very time consuming)
- 1 respondent suggested the deadline date be emblazoned on the response form
- 1 suggested a topographic map be included with future reports
- 3 had concerns with the content of the report
- 1 respondent wanted to ensure that, when the results show the majority favor wilder ness preservation, that the Canadian Parks Service will do so

Selected Quotes:

Thank you for sending me this report. I have enjoyed reading it and its nice to see all parks have some problems and if we all pull together we may "save them for tomorrow". Thank you. Good luck in your future plans. P.S. I enjoyed the summary you sent me on Public Input on Management Plan Review.

I feel there is need for more input regarding year round versus seasonal use of the park. This is the central issue of this management plan, I feel, and is deserving of a complete airing and maximal public input!

Comment period is ridiculously short. I received this publication Dec. 28 and the deadline

is Jan 10/1990. I wanted to write and ask for clarification from Waterton Park re: northern access roads, but now, I will never receive an answer on time. In USA for example, a minimum of 90 days is given for a comment period. You give what turns out to be less than 2 weeks. One can hardly find time in one's busy schedule to absorb the Background Information supplied. Picking the holiday season for the comment period gives the impression that Parks Canada is not interested in public consultation.

Along the right path, but consultation with experts outside the Parks Service should be instituted at a higher level, with the view that a greater understanding of possible problems and solutions may be achieved.

Thank you for providing the opportunity for comment. The volume "Background Information" is very informative and no doubt will be useful for other purposes in the future . Thank you for providing it.

Remarkable opportunity for us to express concerns about the future of our environment. Thank you very much.

Could a topographical map of the area including the park be included in future publications?

I hope when the results show that the majority favour wilderness preservation that the parks department will accede to this and say no to further development, otherwise the process is meaningless. Wilderness is now endangered due to the demand for "amenities".

I appreciate the completeness of the survey, but the questionnaire is incredibly time-consuming.

Upon receiving this package I glanced at it, didn't see a deadline date, put it aside for future consideration. Upon picking it up to complete, I saw the deadline date was past. I'm sending it anyway because I feel so strongly about this park and hope that there is still time for my views to be considered. Possibly the deadline date could be emblazoned across the cover of the Response Form for people like me.

Section Three - Public Comments - Workshop Sessions

Workshop sessions included discussion groups on four topics: resource protection, the backcountry, the frontcountry, and the townsite. The sessions were mainly information exchanges, with Canadian Parks Service staff present to clarify issues, answer questions, and record concerns.

3.1 Resource Protection and Management

Two discussion groups addressed resource protection, with 28 people attending. In total, 97 comments or topics were made or raised.

The majority of concerns focused on protecting park resources, particularly animal protection. Some concerns were more general and included habitat loss and people feeding animals, while many were species-specific concerns. Regarding bears, there were questions about bear management, discussions about the importance of wetlands for grizzlies, the need to close areas to protect bears, and the importance of more public education. Bison were also discussed, including concerns with the site, questions about whether there should be bison in the park and, alternatively, why the bison were fenced. Fish were discussed, especially stocking lakes and the contradiction of allowing fishing in a national park.

Comments on vegetation included general concerns about protection of vegetation, succession, the knapweed problem, protection of fescue prairie, and questions about whether ecological control of caterpillars had been tried.

The need to protect land outside the park boundaries in order to protect the park through a "buffer zone" was of great concern. There were also some questions about the definition of "wilderness" zones.

Another major area for discussion was the development of roads, powerlines, and cutlines. There were concerns about the aesthetic impacts of such development. Discussions dealt with construction and rehabilitation issues, and opposition to more roads and the improvment of Red Rock road.

3.2 Backcountry Opportunities

Three discussion groups were held to discuss backcountry issues. Twenty-seven people attended, and 115 comments or topics were discussed.

The majority of the discussion focused on backcountry hiking and camping. Many comments addressed the appropriateness of facilities; generally, there was opposition to anything other than basic facilities. The strongest agreement was apparent in discussions regarding roofed accommodation. Five people advocated removal of accommodation or questioned its necessity, while one person supported simple shelters.

Regarding the reservation system and quotas, there was consistent support for a system, with various suggestions for implementation. Suggestions regarding quotas included keeping the limits low, reducing the number of people at campsites, adjusting the number of campsites, and limiting day use, although it was acknowledged that this would be difficult.

There was great concern about the impact of visitors, with comments including that: the determining factor in quotas should be impact; campgrounds should be closed if heavily impacted, perhaps on a rotational basis; and damaged areas should not just be closed and expected to regenerate, but must be managed better.

There was support for boardwalks, to minimize impact, and for temporary trail closures when trail conditions are poor. There were suggestions that no new trails be built, and that trails in bear habitat be relocated.

There was a controversy about open fires. Three respondents supported a stove-only policy, several suggested supplying firewood for a fee to prevent tree cutting, and one supported allowing fires only in an emergency.

Suggestions regarding the improvment of background information included the need for better education at trailheads and kitchens, a pamphlet outlining park rules, the need for accurate information, and the need for information on low-impact use.

Other concerns frequently discussed included horse and bicycle use. Most comments regarding bicycle use in the backcountry ranged from opposition to any bicycles, to support for restrictions of bicycles, to opposition to any restrictions on bicycle use. Others suggested an increase in the number of trails for bicycles, education about safe biking practices, and fairness in policies regarding horses and bicycles (either increase bicycle access or decrease horse access). It was suggested that horse use be controlled, perhaps through a permit system; that the numbers of groups should be controlled; and that smaller groups do not cause problems.

3.3 Frontcountry Recreation

Three discussion groups discussed frontcountry issues. A total of 26 people attended, with 116 comments or topics raised. The discussions focused on various visitor activities, particularly golfing, water activities, bicycling, camping, winter activities, and information needs.

Almost half the comments regarding the golf course related to inadequate maintenance and problems with the quality of the course. Other comments included concerns about the environmental impacts of the course, opposition to any development outside the townsite, and concern about the enforcement of regulations. There was some support for upgrading the course, but none for expansion. Several people indicated support for the golf course because of the memorable experience it offers.

In the comments regarding water activities there was opposition to water scooters, jetskiing and big boats. Support was given for enforcement and control, and for some kind of permit system for lake users. Requests were made for more education for windsurfers, a limit to the number of windsurfers, and suggestions for more facilities for windsurfers,„scubadivers, and summer and offseason lake users. There were suggestions made for widening and repairing the docks. There was opposition to allowing fuel tanks at the docks and there was concern about the environmental impacts of power boats, of sewage, and oil pollution. It was also pointed out that storm sewers from the town flow into the marina, so that much of the debris, oil and gas at the marina could be from the town.

Bicycling in the frontcountry was also discussed. There was support for bike paths, suggestions for new bike trails, and concern for keeping bike/people conflicts down through the use of bells, education, and separate paths: To address concerns over the accommodation of touring cyclists a hostel was recommended, as was relaxing rules for the number of people allowed on a campsite. Regarding trail bike riding, there was support for controlling bike trails, opposition to altering trails for bikes, and suggestions for new bike trails.

On the question of camping, there was opposition to expansion of campgrounds and to privitization in the park, and concern about campgrounds outside the park. One participant felt that people forced to camp outside the park feel excluded from park. A questionnaire was recommended to determine what visitors really want, need, and do.

There was support for winter activities, but concern about expanding facilities to increase winter use. It was suggested that one or two facilities could be opened in the winter to see if there is a demand, but without putting in sewers, heating, etc. One respondent pointed out that people come in winter because it is quiet, and that increasing winter use will change who comes.

There were a number of comments about the information provided to park users. There were suggestions for enlarging the information centre, for developing better displays and self guided tours, and for providing interpretation services on boats. One respondent thought that informa-

tion should only be available at the information centre (no advertising elsewhere), while there was also a suggestion for cooperation between the park information centre and the private sector. There were concerns that too much paper is produced, that information given out at the information booth is sometimes wrong, and that there is not enough manpower to provide information for sightseers, strollers, and picnickers.

The other major group of comments related to resource protection and management. A variety of topics were raised. Comments regarding wildlife included trail closures to protect grizzly cubs, providing information to visitors about protecting wildlife, and giving wildlife habituation a priority. Comments about wilderness included suggestions for parts of the backcountry being set aside as a bear reserve, with no access; opposition to restricting access to Zone 1 areas; giving precedence to preservation over development; concerns that animals do not recognize zoning; and a question of whether natural resources are high on the parks priority list. There was concern about any use of animal control (such as gopher control at the golf course) in a national park, and concern about pollution. Suggestions regarding infrastructure included leaving roads as they are, decreasing speed limits, not adding pulloffs or widening roads, and a question about plans for any new interpretation turnoffs.

3.4 Townsite

The townsite discussion group focussed almost entirely on townsite issues, with a great range of topics covered.

The townsite character was discussed, as was a motif for buildings in the town, and the town size. Changes to the townsite, such as new street lights and telephone transmission were discussed, as was zoning in the townsite. Facilities for the handicapped and the implications of an aging society were also considered. Budget issues, privitization, and the town economic situation were also raised.

Issues related to use in winter were raised, including snow removal, the number of visitors, and the use of cottages. Win-fall from trees and the fire hazard of cedar shakes were also of concern. Leased land was discussed, including landscaping leasehold property, and the use of the lease holder committee as a means of communication.

The possibility of hostels was raised, a hotel at the golf course discussed, and recommendations made for adding trees to the townsite campground and for expanding Crandell campground. The guard rail by Knight Lake, backroads, park signs, and high water were also discussed, as was the Kootenay Brown monument, the Waterton National History Association museum, and pets.